

# The Review of English Studies

---

VOL. XVIII.—No. 71.

JULY, 1942

---

## HEROES AND VILLAINS:

SHAKESPEARE, MIDDLETON, BYRON, DICKENS

By ELMER E. STOLL

In a recent book on Shakespeare which I value not only because it is well written but also because, among still other reasons, it follows Johnson rather than Bradley, there is a tendency, in both thought and expression, that I consider not true to Johnson or to Shakespeare himself. The paradoxical, I mean. Of Hamlet Mr. Mark Van Doren says: 'He has been called the best of men and the worst of men. One judgment is as just as the other' (p. 190). So he says of Othello that he 'is both the best and the worst of men; he is both superior to passion and its slave' (p. 225).

That, so far as the phrasing is concerned, is in the spirit of the present-day highbrow criticism; but so far as the dramatist's characterization is concerned, it is in the spirit of Byron and Victor Hugo, of the Terrific novels and Schiller's *Räuber*, with their magnanimous bandits and high-thinking pirates, who, in varying proportions, are both angels and also demons, and in structure are incarnated contradictions, 'embodied antitheses, premeditated paradoxes'. Such are the *Giaour*, the *Corsair*, and *Lara*, *Valjean*, *Javert*, and *Frollo*, *Hernani*, *Gomez*, and *Lucrece*, *Walpole's* (and *Byron's*) *Manfred*, *Beckford's* *Vathek*, *Schiller's* *Karl Moor* and *Schweizer*. Extremes and extravagances of love and hatred, of cruelty and tenderness, of egoism and magnanimity, of pride and (but rarely!)

humility, of ruthlessness and remorse! Not that Mr. Van Doren's Hamlet and Othello have the same traits or features as the Romantic characters; but theirs they have in similar combination and by a similar method—continual contrast, logical rather than psychological or dramatic. This is not in the spirit of the traditional conventions operating in either Shakespearean tragedy—supernaturally instructed vengeance and feigned madness in the one or villainous contriving and persuasion in the other. Coleridge's principle, the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities, applies to a poem, of course, as well as to a drama, and for that matter to architecture and the plastic arts as well as to the oral; but by Mr. Van Doren, if he is thinking of it at all, it is applied without much regard (I cannot but presume) to differences in medium. He ignores the primacy of plot, of situation, in Shakespearean drama (as in the ancient) when compared to modern drama or to the novel; and derives the action from the character. 'The evil in *Othello* is more than an atmosphere. It is a force, and its origin, like the origin of everything else in the tragedy, is the character of the hero' (p. 225). 'Nothing that is in Iago', he says again, 'is absent from Othello' (p. 228).

Thus Iago becomes, instead of the antagonist, the anti-hero, almost a phase of the hero, his Mr. Hyde; and the hero himself, instead of depending on an agency like the villain (or the ghost or fate in *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and ancient tragedy) for being brought to the point of doing the 'deed of horror', does it out of his own nature and of his own accord. And thus the contrasts which Shakespeare intended, that between the hero and the villain, and that (less external and entire) between the character and the action, are obliterated, and another, likewise between good and evil, is established within the bosom of the hero alone.

This shift of the interest—of the contrast—to be sure, corresponds to the shift in modern drama, the action of which is supposed to proceed (mainly, not as with Mr. Van Doren, wholly) from the character. And that in turn is in keeping with the spirit and method of French classic drama—of Corneille and Racine—rather than the Elizabethan and the Hellenic, though the inner conflict there, as in modern drama and novel both, is not extravagant and paradoxical as in Byron and Hugo. Even in the Elizabethan drama, at its decadence, the development was in the same direction. Whether there was anything of a struggle or not, the evil arose, more than before that, out of the character, not from fate or a villain; though

(as often in art) the conventional, traditional structure lingered on, sometimes without its original function, sometimes with the function disguised. Of Middleton, one of the greatest of this later period, Professor Herford observes: 'His habitual occupation with depraved types becomes an artistic method: he creates characters which fascinate without making the smallest appeal to sympathy, tragedy which harrows without rousing either pity or terror, and language which disdains charm, but penetrates by remorseless veracity and by touches of strange and sudden power.'<sup>1</sup> So far, so good; but (as it seems to me) that is not the whole story.

Passion, not character, and (in effect) sympathy or pity and terror, not veracity, as all the great critics agree, from Aristotle, Cicero, and Longinus down, are what in tragedy is all-important; and in Middleton's *Changeling* the universally admired scene, that between Beatrice and De Flores (III. iv), is one in which something of the conventional, unrealistic method still asserts itself. The action does not proceed strictly from the character, so far as Beatrice is concerned. Though otherwise clever enough, she suffers from the same sort of 'stupidity' that has actually been complained of in *Ædipus* and *Othello*. In this, as in the previous colloquy with the villain (which should share the honours), it is psychologically improbable that, hiring the ugly dependant to kill her fiancé in order to have her heart's desire, she should not suspect the price she shall have to pay. But Leigh Hunt, Swinburne, and Arthur Symonds, I fancy, would have been startled by William Archer's<sup>2</sup> complaint that the author had not 'arranged things so that Beatrice could reasonably expect her hired assassin to be content with his money-wage'. To have done so would have ruined the situation, would have cut short the palpitating approach of the fair murderess to the point of her tragic outcry:

Why 'tis impossible thou canst be so wicked  
Or shelter such a cunning cruelty  
'To make his death the murderer of my honour.

Here there is passion rather than psychology; emotional—dramatic—effect rather than truth to life; and the character somewhat in contrast to conduct instead of being its source. In her impetuous and imperious desire, she does not dream of a man, so far removed in station and person, as so far presuming, though, if flesh and blood, a woman clever as she would have done that. It is 'wickedness',

<sup>1</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, sub Middleton.

<sup>2</sup> *Old Drama and the New* (Boston, 1923), p. 97.

it is 'cruelty', a startling surprise with an ironical contrast in the utterance of it—'worthy of the greatest dramatist that ever lived', says Swinburne, which by more adequately realistic preparation would be dulled and reduced.

Rightly to respond to Middleton, as to Shakespeare, we must take the point of view expected by him. It is upon the situation, not the psychology, that both dramatist and audience are intent, upon the bigness of the danger looming before the lady, not upon the improbability of her failing to see it. And the technique, the manipulation, contributes to that end. Middleton has arranged, or contrived, better than Archer thinks. The latter objects to 'the gallant young gentleman of the source' being replaced by the 'hideously ugly and ruffianly retainer' (though that makes the prospect of her falling into his clutches both more terrible and, in her eyes, more unimaginable); and he wrongly takes De Flores' feeling for her to be 'a combination of lust and hatred', adding that she knows it. But from his soliloquies and asides, and from the *double entente* thus illumined, we know as she—to her intellectual credit, therefore—cannot, that 'soul and body', as Swinburne says, he is 'absorbed by one consuming force of passionately cynical desire'. Moreover, her very dislike and mistrust of him, which for a modern reader may make her subsequent conduct only more improbable, are given the contrary effect.

The next good mood I find my father in  
I'll get him quite discarded (II. i. 91).

And, the next scene, this is in the back of her mind as she employs him. In her exit speech she mutters to herself:

I shall rid myself  
Of two inveterate loathings at one time (II. ii. 145).

All this, of course, is dramaturgy, not realism, and still less is it psychology. No doubt heroine and villain, both, might have been made more plausible, as by her having been more engrossed with her purposes and by his having not so continually betrayed his own; but —*optique du théâtre!*—both he and she then would have been less exciting to the audience. Here it is as with Othello and Oedipus. We in the audience must see the cards Iago or Fate is playing against them; the heroes should not—and must.

Later developments are so vast a subject that I can only pick out one or two points that occur to me as relevant to my previous discussions. In the novel there is no such need of condensation, of



heavily coloured contrast, and in the novel, as we know it, the action proceeds more plausibly from the character. But not altogether, as I have recently shown, in *Le Rouge et le Noir* or in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*; <sup>1</sup> and at least two good novelists and critics, Stevenson and Gissing, celebrate the 'dramatic novel', in which passion rather than character, and sympathy rather than faithful observation, prevail.<sup>2</sup> De Foe, moreover, the pioneer, a reputed realist and certainly in many regards an unquestionable one, is, despite (or perhaps because of) his sordid, humble, often ignoble subjects, as intent upon sympathy as any dramatist. And he has something of the Elizabethan method of opposition between good and evil. There are tempters, and not of the wholly internal sort. There are no villains, but there is, pretty frequently, the Devil, who lays a snare for Moll or puts the notion into her head; and in that novel as well as in *Roxana* and *Colonel Jack* there are subordinate (though not devilish) characters, such as 'my governess' and Amy, who somewhat take his place. It is these that bear the brunt of responsibility; it is these that, like Shakespeare's villains, are in their wickedness naïve or comic, not the heroines, with whom sympathy must be kept.

'De Foe's sense of evil is so evidently that of a formalist', says Mr. MacCarthy, a little exaggerating, 'that we have all the excitement of moving in a wicked world without the unpleasantness of coming into contact with a single wicked person.'<sup>3</sup> 'A formalist', like Dante, who for one fault thrusts otherwise excellent people like Francesca, Brunetto, and Ulysses, deep down in the Inferno; 'without the unpleasantness', for these are the milder shades of Purgatory; in short, here too are the great advantages, without the disadvantages, of evil-doing in story (though on a humbler, prosier level) as I have repeatedly exhibited them in Shakespearean and ancient tragedy.

And not only is the standard of morality a fixed one; it is also clearly and frankly recognized and acknowledged by the wrongdoer, as by Macbeth, King John, and the others, even beforehand.<sup>4</sup> Conscience, again, is of the traditional and supernatural sort, external and unequivocal. 'I did what my own conscience convinced me at the very time I did it', says Roxana, 'was horribly

<sup>1</sup> 'Poetry and the Passions Again', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, October, 1941.

<sup>2</sup> *A Humble Remonstrance*, South Seas Ed. XIII, 149f; *Immortal Dickens* (1925), p. 214.

<sup>3</sup> *Criticism* (1932), p. 222.

<sup>4</sup> See my *Shakespeare and Other Masters* (1940), pp. 27-8, 34; *Shakespeare Studies* (1927), pp. 349-55.

unlawful, scandalous, and abominable'.<sup>1</sup> Beforehand there is no self-deception, and little or no self-exculpation afterwards. Though there are tempters, there are no temptations, which, as Stevenson, complaining of Tolstoy's *Power of Darkness*, reminds us, 'are beautiful'. Though Moll's and Roxana's motives—poverty, avarice, vanity, amorous passion—are laid bare, this is not so done—particularly with the last-named, which a Flaubert or a Balzac would have amply and alluringly presented—as to make their conduct (however more exciting) more intelligible. On the sexual subject De Foe keeps within the limits of a statement. It is (to compare the small with the great) as with Macbeth's ambition, which, apart from the mere statement, is supposed sufficiently to appear from his conduct: quite unpsychologically, though dramatically, it is the deterrents, not the incentives and seductive imaginings, that occupy their thoughts. And it is, again as with him, an external rather than internal struggle, against a conscience that is a still small voice from above (beforehand), from below (afterwards), not from within—a certain fearful looking forward unto judgment, not repentance. So it was, more clearly, in Elizabethan times, and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Evadne*, unwilling to kill her king asleep (as Hamlet to kill his when praying) lest she should 'rock him to another world', which is heaven, wakens both him and 'his evil angel, his sick conscience,' that he may die in sin. Not in sorrow for it. Moll and Roxana, both, are troubled and even tormented as they remember their crimes and misdemeanours (the former word they honestly prefer); but though for those persons whom they have made to suffer they are sometimes a little sorry (and more so than Macbeth and his Lady), it is not to the point of amends, of turning over a new leaf and making restitution.

And there is the same mythical, mystical conscience in the heroes and villains (the distinction between them, as not between Shakespeare's, is obscure) of Walpole and his successors on the stage or in the novel, of Byron and Hugo. It fits in with the whole antithetical scheme: remorse without repentance, but in souls (unlike Moll's and Roxana's) too great to repent, as Byron says of the *Corsair*<sup>2</sup> and Lara, and as the poet Campbell said of Lady Macbeth. At this point (remorse or impenitence, either) the tradition is not that of Aaron, Richard, and Iago, but of Marlowe's Mephistopheles and Milton's Satan—grand, romantic figures, with a grievance but not

<sup>1</sup> *Roxana* (ed. Brimley Johnson, n.d.), pp. 34 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> II. x. 'impenitent remorse'—'the weak alone repent'; *Lara* II. xix.

without compassion, with a love or devotion though perhaps turned to hatred, and with other virtues though thwarted and distorted, themselves being not inclined to evil but thrown back upon it, melancholy not merry, solitary not convivial, witty or bitter not comic. The Marlovian or Miltonic tradition was almost unavoidable in the process of welding the two antagonistic natures—villain and hero—together: but the main underlying purpose of this was to recover for the novel the passionate abundance and striking contrast of the Elizabethan stage. So hero and villain were commingled instead of the hero falling into the villain's snare. Some of the supernatural machinery—ghosts, omens, and marvels—lingered on; but with little artistic result, and external fate gave place to the villain-hero's fatalism. The conscience, indeed, is the point of greatest resemblance to the true Elizabethan hero; but there is no danger of mistaking the Byronic figure for either that or anything in nature. The chief æsthetic effect is owing to the fire of the presentation, and to the poet's making a mystery of (what indeed by the nature of the situation he could not satisfactorily reveal) the hero's past, the secret of the unholy mixture, the injury that had so 'warped' him,<sup>1</sup> the curse upon him, which he in turn brings on those he loves.<sup>2</sup> 'Ténébreux, fatal, amer', says Lanson<sup>3</sup> of the Byronic, Hugoesque hero; 'il sort on ne sait d'où, il passe enveloppé d'un triple prestige de mystère, de crime, et d'amour':—there is no such single figure in Shakespeare or in really popular English tragedy. And yet of a judicial conscience he has need not for his psychology, with which it is incompatible, but for the stage, or (however poetical) a stagy tale or novel.

Dickens, though he was pretty far from being the 'dramatic' novelist of whom Stevenson was dreaming, had perhaps come nearer to him than any other of Stevenson's time. As everyone knows, he was hugely interested in the theatre, now and then trod the boards himself, and has many theatrical and (sometimes) melodramatic traits

<sup>1</sup> *Corsair* i. xi. In this characterization, as well as the indebtedness to Milton, Mr. Logan P. Smith has anticipated me, *Milton and his Critics* (1941), p. 49; but cf. *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, p. 279.

<sup>2</sup> Of the curse brought upon her whom he loves, the chief example is *Manfred*. But also in the form of a curse, or brand of Cain, the ancient fate, sometimes inherited, comes to life again, as in *C.H.* i. lxxxiii, 8-9; iii, lxx, 8-9; iv, xxxiv, 6; *Lara* i, xviii. So in the terrific novels before Byron; and even in *Redgauntlet* (1824), the horseshoe on the brow and the doom that the valour of the family should be fruitless.

<sup>3</sup> *Histoire* (1898), p. 964. How much also of Schiller directly or of Chateaubriand too there may be in this (cf. E. Estève, *Byron et le romantisme* (1907) M. Lanson does not stop to inquire; nor can we.

in his art. No one in the nineteenth century, moreover, on the realistic and comic side, came so near to Shakespeare. Chesterton in contrasting him with Thackeray says that he 'writes realism to make the incredible credible';<sup>1</sup> and exactly that is what for some years I have been endeavouring to show that Shakespeare does, though more in poetry and tragedy, as in *Hamlet* and *Othello*. Yet he did it in prose and in comedy, too. Les grands sujets de la comédie, Corneille might have written, remembering Aristophanes, vont toujours au delà du vraisemblable. Thackeray is very truthful; Dickens is more original and entertaining, as Major Bagstock is than Major Pendennis. Art, as Mr. Santayana says, 'is the response to the demand for entertainment, for the stimulation of our senses and imagination, and truth enters into it only as it subserves these ends'.<sup>2</sup> And for the likes of Sairey Gamp, as Gissing avers, one must go to the very heights of world literature, to him who bodied forth Dame Quickly and Juliet's nurse.

With Sairey and Falstaff I have dealt in another article;<sup>3</sup> and these are also alike, and representative of their authors, in that so much of their vitality resides in their speech. By that we know these and other Shakespearean or Dickensian characters, rather than by their conduct, which may be improbable, or than by the analysis, which, if there is any, is often summary or dull. 'The best of his creatures', Professor Elton says of Dickens, 'whether on the greater scale or the lesser, whether Pecksniffs or Gargerys, are triumphs of style rather than of character-drawing.'<sup>4</sup> No third author in English or perhaps in the world has successfully distinguished and differentiated so many characters, in so large a measure, by their vocabulary, accent, cadence, and rhythm, by 'the tone of voice, the trick of utterance'. What Pope said of printing Shakespeare's dialogue without the name-tags would apply equally well to the novelist. 'He declared that every word spoken by his characters was audible to him'—as every word spoken by his own must have been to Shakespeare, and so to us should be, even in print.<sup>5</sup> And in general

<sup>1</sup> *Victorian Literature* (1923), p. 125. Cf. Gissing, *Charles Dickens* (N. Y. 1898), pp. 110-11, where independently a similar point of view is taken and Bagstock is contrasted with Major Pendennis.

<sup>2</sup> *The Nature of Beauty* (Borgum), p. 81.      <sup>3</sup> 'Falstaff Again', not yet printed.

<sup>4</sup> *Survey 1830-80* (1920), ii. 217.

<sup>5</sup> This is, of course, a common illusion of the artistic imagination, which fairly objectifies itself; like Michelangelo's setting his figure free from the marble as he carves it or Rousseau's removing of veil after veil from the landscape as he paints it; it is not any justification for the inartistic delusion of the critic that the character takes the bit between his teeth and runs away with his author, saying and doing

it is the same sort of speech—impetuous and riotous, fanciful and highly-coloured. 'Great draughts of words', Chesterton says of Dickens, and of Shakespeare it is still truer, 'are to him like great draughts of wine—pungent and yet refreshing, light and yet leaving him in a glow.'<sup>1</sup> For though Dickens wrote only prose and Shakespeare mostly drama, of both alike Professor Elton's remarks about Dickens hold good, 'a passionate creature, ever straining towards the lyrical'.<sup>2</sup> In tragic or contemplative vein as well as the comic this applies; but what they had most in common was what they had in common with their England. It is the lyricism of fantasy and grotesquery, of witlessness rather than of wit, of nonsense rather than of sense.<sup>3</sup> There are Falstaff in his bragging and Pistol in his swaggering, as well as those delicious idiots, Shallow and Silence, Dogberry and Verges, Aguecheek, Launce, Cloten, Trinculo, on the one hand; and there are, on the other hand, Sairey and Betsy, Dick Swiveller and the Marchioness, Toots and Susan Nipper, Cuttle and Bunsby, Pecksniff and Chadband, old Willet, the Micawbers, Bailey Junior, Mould the undertaker, and similar revellers or flounders with words and notions. For 'the English', as Hazlitt said before Dickens had as yet risen above the horizon, 'are the only people left who understand and relish nonsense. We are not merry and wise but indulge our mirth to excess and folly'.<sup>4</sup> And it was after Hazlitt, in Dickens' own time, that nonsense came pure and neat, with Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll.

Nothing can justify this extreme relaxation, Hazlitt continues, but extreme tension; and while Dickens does not, 'like Shakespeare, presently take our breath away in following 'his eagle flights' nor (at other times) 'make the cordage of our hearts crack', 'justification' he does provide. There is plenty of tension; there is plenty of high excitement, though not always truly tragic or pathetic; and as Chesterton says, Dickens 'certainly created a personal devil in every one of his books'.<sup>5</sup>

These villains, too, are Shakespearean, not Byronic, neither Miltonic nor Marlowesque. They are not grandiose villain-heroes;

things—getting drunk, even—without the author's permission or knowledge. It is, however, justification for the critic, reading with the same spirit that the author writes, in so using his inner ear and eye, not depending mainly on analysis. Cf. my *Shakespeare Studies* (1927), pp. 260-1, 117-27, and my treatment of Morgann's 'historic beings', 'Falstaff Again'.

<sup>1</sup> *Charles Dickens* (N. Y. 1907), p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> *Charles Dickens* (1907), pp. 285-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Survey 1830-1880*, ii. 216.

<sup>5</sup> 'Merry England'.

and like Shakespeare's own, have little or nothing in common with the real hero of the story. The legerdemain of antithesis or paradox is over; and like Shakespeare's, they have 'no redeeming points'. There is none, as Chesterton says, in Squeers, Monck, Ralph Nickleby, Bill Sikes, Quilp, Brass, Mr. Chester, Pecksniff, Jonas Chuzzlewit, Carker, Uriah Heep, Blandois, 'or in a hundred more'.<sup>1</sup> And why none? Chesterton says Dickens 'wished to have an obstreperous and incalculable enemy. He wished to keep alive the idea of combat, which means, of necessity, a combat against something individual and alive.' So did Shakespeare, as well as his audience, and Dickens' public, much greater than Byron's; or rather, they did not wish it, but so to have it was in keeping with their way of thinking about the world and with their way of deriving emotions from a story.

Though more like Shakespeare's than are any other modern villains, those of Dickens have, however, as Chesterton says, 'a peculiar and vigorous life of their own'. They are no imitations. They are like Shakespeare's—in their originality. Without redeeming point, they attract, and by their abounding vitality and ingenuity, their wit and humour, their unmistakable individuality as it appears in their speech. Like Shakespeare's, moreover, they are merry—romantic melancholy, for novel readers, had had its day—or in their gloom they are likely to be grotesque. Morose people, on the other hand, Dickens, as Mr. Santayana elsewhere says, 'made wicked, not virtuous in their own way, so that the protest of his temperament against his environment never took a radical form nor went back to first principles. He needed to feel, in his writing, that he was carrying the sympathies of every man with him'. And all that is like Shakespeare too. But Quilp, though as a dwarf he might be expected to be bitter or disillusioned like Scott's Black one, has, as Chesterton puts it, a 'kind of hellish happiness, an atrocious hilarity that makes him go bounding about like an india-rubber ball'.<sup>2</sup> So he is more like Richard III, the hunchback.

At one point, however, Dickens resembles the Romantic school—the external conscience. Shakespeare gives none to his demons—Aaron, Richard,<sup>3</sup> Iago—but only to evil-doers such as the Macbeths and (on their deathbeds) to Cardinal Beaufort and Cymbeline's Queen. Not that the Dickens villains are too great, too proud, for real repentance, but too disinclined—at that point, indeed, too

<sup>1</sup> *Charles Dickens* (1907), pp. 285–6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 286.

<sup>3</sup> Except momentarily, on seeing the ghosts.



natural. What they had done they had wanted to do, and like most criminals have no disposition to regret it till—and then not sincerely—under the influence of a priest or under the shadow of the gallows—in Dickens not often even then.

That the conscience-smitten evil-doer is not 'sorry' Dickens makes as plain as De Foe or Byron; and sometimes, as in Bradley Headstone and Jonas Chuzzlewit, there is not even this supernatural remorse but only the fear of discovery. Oftener, however, it is the mysterious spiritual retribution, and on the deathbed 'the horrors', as in *Magwitch's* story: 'So Arthur was a-dying, and a-dying poor, and with the horrors on him' (chap. 42); or as at the bad end made by Fagin: 'He grew so terrible, at last, in all the tortures of his evil conscience that one man could not bear to sit there eyeing him alone; and so the two kept watch together' (chap. 52). And long before the final earthly reckoning some of them, like Bill Sikes and the steward Rudge, are 'haunted' by the figures of their victims.

Poe,<sup>1</sup> in his review of *Barnaby Rudge*, complained of the steward's suffering the sting of conscience—so many years and so keenly—as inconsistent with the brutality of his character. Yes, if the conscience is what Poe, evidently, takes it to be; but if it is the external, supernatural sort, time does not count, or the sting would grow sharper towards the end. And really, if psychology is to be considered, that thought might lend greater weight to the objections of some candid critics to the spiritual torments of the Macbeths the night of the murder, before the deed and after. Time and reflection, more naturally, might bring not only remorse but repentance—when weary of the crown, not when ruthlessly grasping for it. (This psychological advantage Dickens deliberately rejects not only by the continuance of the brutality but also by making Rudge turn a deaf ear to the pleadings of his wife for a change of heart before his death.) Be that as it may, 'the hypersensitiveness of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth', as Mr. Chapman has it (or, in other words, their consciences thus unplausibly intruding), 'is one of Shakespeare's greatest strokes of genius'.<sup>2</sup> His originality, however, lies, as is usual with the greatest dramatists (or other artists, for that matter) only in doing better what others had done well or indifferently before him, and in availing himself of the conceptions, the prepossessions and prejudices, already established in the minds of the public. It is so that the greatest

<sup>1</sup> *Works* (1914), vii. p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> *Glance toward Shakespeare* (1922), p. 71; *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, p. 34.

emotions are aroused, the biggest effects produced. Now this external conscience is a resource of tragic horror and terror, and in Christian times to a higher degree than in the ancient. 'It is a bodying-forth of unearthly fears and more than mortal misery.'<sup>1</sup> It extends the scene, as with Dante, and more certainly and terrifically than with the ancients, beyond the limits of the grave. And of itself it creates an emotional situation, the character being, so far (and the hero of course still farther), superior to his conduct, in contrast with it. To complain of the sensitiveness of the Macbeths and (*a longo intervallo*) of the Steward is to complain of the initial postulate or premise, of the structure, of the tragedy or the novel as a whole. And in *Barnaby Rudge* it is, however improbable, no contemptible story, this of the villain, himself thought by every one, including the reader, to have been killed long ago with his master, now haunting as well as haunted, continually visiting the scene and neighbourhood (compare Dostoyevsky's Raskolnikoff!), and especially on anniversaries of the murder, one of which nights the sexton (properly enough) takes him for his ghost. (To keep the spirit quiet and afar—*requiescat!*—are not death-day anniversaries still ceremonially observed by the Catholics, as by the pagans before them?) On the night of the storming of the mansion, as he looks in upon the innkeeper and inquires about it, the alarm-bell then sounding as it did when rung by his master just before death, he gives a fearful cry and rushes away. And it is in the ruins of the house that he presently is captured. The conscience that is a nemesis, the fire let down from heaven, 'his evil angel', the worm that never dies! But psychologically inconsistent and fragmentary as this all is, it is not, despite the traditional element, remote from human nature; after a sort, it is simple, sensuous, and passionate; and the murder story as it is serves for a mystery in the background of the novel, as with a better psychology it wouldn't.

Above I have twice dealt with Macbeth, and now I wonder whether there and in previous discussions <sup>2</sup> I have sufficiently answered the objections of the critic Gourmont (though after making them he magnanimously himself declares them not worth answering):

mais l'esprit demeure insatisfait, parce que les caractères incertains ont plutôt donné ce qu'exigeait d'eux la logique des situations que ce que demandait la logique de l'esprit.

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespeare Studies*, p. 352, and compare the whole discussion pp. 349-55.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Studies*, index, sub Gourmont; and *Promenades Littéraires* (1912), iv. pp. 312, 314, 315-16.

On voit l'ambition et le crime naître en même temps dans le coeur de Macbeth, sans que rien nous ait préparés à admettre cela. De fait, on le voit, on ne le comprend pas.

Avec Shakespeare tout est possible et je crois qu'il a eu moins d'intentions profondes qu'on ne lui suppose, et qu'il s'attardait moins à la vérité psychologique qu'aux surprises de l'action.

La scène de la tache et du somnambulisme n'est pas moins saisissante ni moins artificielle. Rien n'est encore expliqué et on a peine à admettre qu'une femme si hardie dans le crime soit si profondément déprimée, aux jours mêmes du triomphe.

The first and the next to the last passages are strikingly in harmony with one in *Some Remarks on the Tragedy of Hamlet*, 1736, with which Shakespearean criticism really began and, on that particular aspect, nearly ended: '... he studyd more to work up great and moving Circumstances to place his Characters in, so as to affect our Passions strongly, he apply'd more to this than he did to the Means or Methods whereby he brought his Characters into those Circumstances' (p. 55). And the second and the fourth express dissatisfaction with the psychology presented in both hero and heroine, a conscience more prominent than the overwhelming passion, a temptation that does not allure.

Though M. Gourmont himself is not convinced, his objections vanish, he says, at the thought—it is Shakespeare's. That means more than most similar avowals, of which there have been plenty. For Gourmont is a great critic, and is a Frenchman; and here, if our notions of either are correct, he is ceasing to be either. Yet he still keeps the essential quality (in critics, paradoxically, the rarest) that of perfect candour. He still 'sees the object as in itself it really is'. He would rather go no farther than go wrong, rather give up criticism than betray it. Like the greatest of philosophers, he knows—and confesses it—when he does not know.

## TIMON OF ATHENS

### AN UNFINISHED PLAY

BY UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

The play of *Timon* has disturbed Shakespeare's critics from an early period and continues to do so. In nearly every respect, from details of style to major characteristics of structure, it is now like, now unlike Shakespeare. Many conjectural explanations of this condition have been offered, but it seems more than usually difficult to reach agreement.<sup>1</sup> Either Shakespeare worked upon an older play of which he retained parts, or he left an unfinished play which was completed by someone else, or the Folio (our only text) is full of cuts and corruptions difficult to explain, or we have merely an unfinished play in which the other 'hand' is negligible or non-existent. These four interpretations are, clearly, not easy to reconcile.

I will not attempt, in these days of restricted space, to recapitulate the excellent work of the bibliographical and textual critics who have discussed the play, for the interpretation to which I incline is not at variance with theirs, and, indeed, rests, as all subsequent criticism must do, upon some of their findings.<sup>2</sup> Nor am I concerned to combat the first three interpretations I mentioned, but, rather, to examine briefly the conclusions to which the fourth may lead us. Sir Edmund Chambers, after mentioning the many theories that have been held, sums up with customary pithiness the position of those who believe in this fourth alternative: 'I do not doubt that it was left unfinished

<sup>1</sup> K. Deighton (1905, 1929, *Arden* edition, *Introd.*) sums up the findings of scholars on this and other points to the beginning of this century. E. K. Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, vol. i, pp. 480-4) lists and refers to those that followed until the year 1930. Little has been added since.

<sup>2</sup> See, again, E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, vol. i, pp. 480-1.

I differ somewhat from Deighton's suggestion (p. xxi) that there was 'some player to whom the editors, failing to find portions known once to have existed, had entrusted the task of putting together the incomplete material', inasmuch as I doubt whether the play had ever reached a state so near completion as this seems to imply. But I would willingly accept the activities of this or some similar functionary in certain of the flat prose scenes which are so undistinguished as to bear the mark of no hand in particular. I differ again from Professor T. M. Parrott's findings in *The Problem of Timon* (1923. Sh. Ass.) in that I incline to see more homogeneity in all but these same scenes and to regard the weaker parts of the play as rough and unfinished drafts by the same hand as the stronger and more nearly finished parts.

by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of its "problem", indicated long ago by Ulrici and others, is that it is unfinished still.<sup>1</sup>

It is as an unfinished play, then, that I should like to consider it, a play such as a great artist might leave behind him, roughed out, worked over in part and then abandoned; full of inconsistencies in form and presentation, with fragments (some of them considerable) bearing the unmistakable stamp of his workmanship scattered throughout. Such a text makes it difficult to believe 'another hand' has been at work upon it, for the confusion, whether it affects details of style or the relations of characters and scenes, is precisely what that hand would have been paid to reduce to order.<sup>2</sup> But if we believe that we have here a unique case in the Shakespeare canon, a play abandoned when only half-worked, and read it through scene by scene in the light of this assumption, we find little which does not seem to be explained thereby.

It is peculiarly fortunate that the first act has in it a large proportion of the play's finished, or relatively finished work. For in this first act the intention of the play, the nature of Shakespeare's mood, something of the dominant theme, are revealed, now clearly now shadowily, but on the whole firmly enough to let us make certain inferences, to use it in some sort as a test of authenticity of style and content in the later parts.

The imagery and the prosody of the opening passages mark them as mature Shakespearean poetry; scenes in which such imagery and such prosody are found must be taken seriously; they will contain, presumably, something that Shakespeare intended to present.<sup>3</sup> The immediate opening up to the entrance of Timon is, it is true, unlike the induction of any other play of his; but we may notice that that is also true of nearly all the plays he wrote after he reached full stature; the theme, in all these, makes its own form. The Jacobean drama offers us a series of notable inductions, and Shakespeare is here, as usual, profoundly original in an age of virtuosos. This passage gives us, moreover, in the poet's allegory, the ironic fore-warning of Timon's fall, a warning which precedes the detailed pre-

<sup>1</sup> William Shakespeare, vol. i, p. 482.

<sup>2</sup> It is worth while to remember, in this connection, that there is no evidence that the play was ever produced. Cf. E. K. Chambers, *op. cit.*, 483.

<sup>3</sup> Here I must differ from T. M. Parrott (*op. cit.*), who finds the opening weak and unlike Shakespeare's work. Professor Caroline Spurgeon (*Shakespeare's Imagery* (1935), pp. 343-5) finds imagery characteristic of Shakespeare scattered throughout the play, and would, on these grounds, 'assign to Shakespeare (p. 344) a much larger part than has hitherto generally been attributed to him.'

sentation of his wealth and extravagance that occupies the first two acts, and is picked up at intervals like a melody, subordinate in the early movements of a symphony and becoming dominant at the climax. But it does more than this. It discloses subtly the deep and penetrating corruption that his wealth has bred. For the poet has a not unworthy idea of the nature and processes of his art (ll. 20-25),<sup>1</sup> and his apostasy is therefore the greater. He is a courtier-poet, one such as other writers as well as Shakespeare had observed, and there are few things that could reveal more swiftly the measure of the world's baseness than this picture of corruption reaching the inner citadel of truth, the integrity of the artist's mind itself. This seems, then, a skilful and significant introduction of the central idea, the hollowness of society and its relations.

This, borne out as it is by the style (the imagery and the blank verse), convinces me that we have here substantially Shakespeare's own introduction, indicating what was his intention. It will be wise, therefore, to accept as also part of Shakespeare's intention whatever in the rest of the play is clearly related to this, in mood, in action or in style.

The latter part of this scene (from the entrance of Apemantus) offers some difficulties, but they are not insuperable. It is certainly a thin patch of writing. There are very few touches of live imagery or music, and these (257-61, 289-92) occur in the later part. Even Apemantus, afterwards an integral part of the play's content and structure affecting both the outer and the inner action, lacks sinew here and is no more than a kind of conventional Diogenes crossed with a little diluted Thersites. I can see no artistic reason for this flatness, but we must admit that there is some, though not so much, of the same kind in other plays that are psychologically related to *Timon*—in *All's Well*, in *Measure for Measure* and even in *Troilus and Cressida*.<sup>2</sup> One might venture the suggestion that this part was roughed out and not finished: it compares badly with the first half of the scene, which was either worked over after roughing out or

<sup>1</sup> Line references are to the Oxford edition of Shakespeare's works, ed. W. J. Craig (1913). With the poet's demeanour here should, of course, be compared that of v. 1, particularly ll. 51, *et seq.*; with his theory of art we may compare Theseus' (*M.S.N.D.*, v. i, 7-17) and perhaps Tamburlaine's (II *Tamb.*, v. ii, 114-20), though this last is a little complicated by a hopelessly corrupt text. But Shakespeare's most significant comment on poetic character is to be found in sonnet cx.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. K. Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 451-2 and 455-6. *Troilus and Cressida* is not strictly analogous to *Timon* in this respect, for the use of prose there is usually functional, having a clearly discernible artistic intention; it may serve, therefore, to indicate rather a resemblance in underlying purpose, clearly expressed in the earlier play and confusedly in the later.



written more eagerly in the first instance. For one reason or for the other, the earlier seems more fully imagined and so more finished.

There is nothing in the second scene to make us withdraw. In fact, the design of the outward action seems sound and broadly based up to the end of the act. As a first act, that is, this one does its work. If the next four had been lost we should have no reason to suspect artistic confusion or collapse in what was to follow. We are clearly promised shock and catastrophe. So close at hand do we feel them that we might guess the main theme of the play, the inner action which the outer events would reveal, to be the effect of that shock on the mind and philosophy of the man who was to suffer it. Looking forward at this point without knowing the rest of the play, we might anticipate some kinship with *Troilus and Cressida* and more with *Lear*; the experience of the central figure will be such, perhaps, as to image some universal law whose operation he discovers and interprets, as does *Lear*. Even a few of the details of Timon's conduct suggest a likeness between his character and *Lear's* at a similar stage of their fortunes; autocracy and imperiousness tinge his generosity with insolence.<sup>1</sup> Some resemblance between their experiences may therefore be intended; a headlong career, to be brought up suddenly by a change of fortune; the reason unseated; the character, ill-balanced already, being totally unfitted to survive the shock.

Moreover, two of the chief characters that appear here are built strongly into the play and do, in fact, maintain their shape and position later when much else goes to wreck. Apemantus' mood seems at first to run counter to that of the play, in churlish opposition. But when the crisis has turned the tide, it is found to be the dominant stream that carries all with it; as the play goes on, there is a slowly deepening power and increasing relevance in his speech which indicates design. Flavius, again, is planted firmly in the action both of events and of ideas. He has, moreover, the special function of uttering in more precise definition the vague warnings and threats of the poet's allegory at the beginning. This theme, which we are never allowed to escape for long, has clearly been foreseen from the beginning.

But beside these indications of deliberate planning of the functional

<sup>1</sup> We may notice especially I. ii, 13-14 and 165-239, *passim*. There are, besides this, unexplained touches of cynicism in the earlier scene (157-61, 172-4) which are perhaps best understood as hints of psychic unbalance in Timon which we would do well to keep in mind from the beginning.

relations of the characters to the main theme, we notice signs of unfinished work in the details of this act. The broken and irregular lines, the patch-work effect of many even of the finest speeches, have long troubled Shakespeare's critics here. They are indeed extremely difficult to explain in terms of any kind of corruption known to bibliographical critics; with the best will in the world, I cannot see how playhouse additions or excisions or the most illegible palimpsest that was ever handed to a compositor in the form of a prompt-copy could have produced just this condition.<sup>1</sup> But I can see without any difficulty at all how a man who was roughing out a scene might leave a speech in this form: it is to my mind as strong evidence as we can find that whoever wrote these passages did not finish them. And the presence of many such in the play, and in speeches of undeniable majesty and power, is likewise the best evidence I could ask that Shakespeare wrote the rest of the play also, and, similarly, left it unfinished. At the risk of being over-explicit, I will cite a passage (actually from a later scene) which embodies the characteristics of these broken speeches wherever they occur.

*Alcib.* My lord,—

*First Sen.* You cannot make gross sins look clear;

To revenge is no valour, but to bear.

*Alcib.* My lords, then, under favour, pardon me,

If I speak like a captain.

Why do fond men expose themselves to battle,

And not endure all threats? sleep upon't,

And let the foes quietly cut their throats

Without repugnancy? If there be

Such valour in the bearing, what make we

Abroad? [why] then, women are more valiant

That stay at home, if bearing carry it,

And the ass more captain than the lion, the felon

Loaded with irons wiser than the judge,

If wisdom be in suffering. O my lords!

As you are great, be pitifully good:

Who cannot condemn rashness in cold blood?

To kill, I grant, is sin's extremest gust;

But, in defence, by mercy, 'tis most just

To be in anger is impiety;

But who [is] that man that is not angry?

Weigh but the crime with this.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> But see T. M. Parrott, *The Problem of Timon* (*Sh. Ass.* 1923), for a very different interpretation of this evidence, with which, in all respect, I find myself unable to agree. Yet another interpretation, with which also I cannot bring myself into agreement, is that of Dixon Wecter (*Shakespeare's Purpose in Timon*, *P. M. L. A.*, xliii, 1928).

<sup>2</sup> *Timon*, III. v, 37-59.

The power both of the language and of the music of individual lines or groups of lines is unmistakable. The speech is a succession of units, sometimes a line and a half, sometimes two, sometimes as many as seven.<sup>1</sup> Very often these units are made up of a half line followed by one or more complete lines and concluded by another half line, sometimes the bracketing of an interjection would restore the flow of a line.<sup>2</sup> These passages, in other words, are jottings, thoughts that form in the writer's mind as prosodic units, but are not yet related prosodically so as to form a verse paragraph or even a continuous succession of blank verse lines. The breaks that occur at the ends of lines 4 and 20, or in the middle of certain lines (6, 8, 10, 12)<sup>3</sup> where the foot and a half or two feet after the pause clearly belong to the thought and movement of the next unit, bear, to my mind, less suggestion of corruption after writing than of writing which has not been re-digested and rendered harmonious. A characteristic of these passages wherever they occur is that prosodic units are, as here, simultaneously units of thought or imagery, complete in themselves even when imperfectly related to their neighbours and to the whole speech. Who that has ever written blank verse in any condition below that of complete collection and concentration, has not experienced this preliminary rush of isolated fragments of music and thought? We may agree that Shakespeare's artistic experience cannot without irreverence be interpreted in terms of any but a very few of those upon record. Nevertheless, some likeness of process may perhaps be presumed.

Taking together, then, these various indications from the first act of *Timon*, I incline to think that what we have here is Shakespeare's work in varying degrees of completion and at varying levels of imaginative intensity but still substantially the first act that he planned, with some of the later action and the main theme already in his mind, and that parts of the design here conceived were strongly enough formed to emerge firm and powerful throughout the play. I think also that he was experimenting with structure; again, as in *Troilus and Cressida*, attempting a theme so original that the form it dictated must inevitably be revolutionary.<sup>4</sup> What was the experi-

<sup>1</sup> As in lines 3-4, 1-2, 13-19.

<sup>2</sup> As in 6-8, 10 and 20.

<sup>3</sup> My numbering is, of course, purely for convenience in reference and has no relation to the text.

<sup>4</sup> The theme in *Troilus and Cressida* is I believe that of disintegration and disjunction itself, one which in its very nature passes almost beyond the scope of drama.

ment in this case and what the consequent form it may be hard to discover.<sup>1</sup> It was certainly not a repetition of that of *Troilus and Cressida*, though it may well have been an advance from that position. And, where that of *Troilus and Cressida* was just within his power to compass and ours to follow, it may be that this of *Timon* was just beyond both.

The second act, however, shows as yet no signs of weakness. Where the first act had been extended and in parts almost leisurely, as fits the induction to an inner action of vast scope, this second act is correspondingly rapid; the audience may be presumed to have grasped what is involved and the action can go forward. Its relation to the preceding act seems sound enough, too, in actual plotting; the change in the direction of Timon's fortunes, for which we have been consciously or unconsciously prepared, is now presented. There are flat passages again, it is true, but the mixture of tediousness with vigorous commentary in II. ii, 73-129, has the same function as similar passages in *Measure for Measure*, it reveals a background that we must take into account if we are to perceive justly the relations of values in the play. And the later part of the second scene (133-242) we can by no means dismiss, for some of the verbal music and its imagery is as powerful as in any play of this period; here at least we have finished or relatively finished work.

But one thing disturbs us in this act, our first meeting with a conspicuous and inexplicable loose end in the character of the Fool. Although the passage in which he appears is well enough written, he is not built into the play. We do not know who he is or where he comes from. We hardly know to whom he belongs. And he disappears never to appear again. We are forced to one of two assumptions: either that he ceased to be part of Shakespeare's design by a change of intention after this scene, or that the scenes or passages in which his function and relation to the play would have appeared were never written or were lost. He is the first, but not the last disturbing element of this kind that we shall find in the play.

The third act gives us, on the whole, an impression of planning, but after the first three scenes we come upon more uneven work than before and upon downright inconsistency. The first three scenes, however, stand well together as a group. I think we can feel in them Shakespeare's design even if they are sometimes unfinished

<sup>1</sup> Nor is it the purpose of this article to discuss either. One of the more interesting modern interpretations is that of Professor Wilson Knight in *The Wheel of Fire* (1930).

in detail. The masterly skill of long experience lies behind the treatment of the parallel episodes of Lucullus, Lucius, Sempronius and Ventidius, so handled, in different ways, as to avoid repetition while building up the impression of accumulation, to reveal at once the individuality of the characters and the monotony of their behaviour. No dramatic novice wrote this scene. There are several long prose passages in the first two scenes, but they all seem to some extent functional; the prose, that is to say, conveys an effect that verse would not so well achieve and moves naturally into verse in Shakespeare's accustomed manner. The broken verse 'jottings' that we have already noticed appear again, sometimes (i. 55-67, ii. 72-95) in a chain of fine images and prosodic units that are as they stand skeletons of verse paragraphs. One detail that first becomes noticeable here is perhaps worth bearing in mind, the brief references to 'the gods', that might be passed over as mere mechanical phrases, were it not that they recur as does an iterative image and culminate in a passage of inescapable significance in a later act.<sup>1</sup> The very presence of such a recurrent minor theme, the more indicative in that it is unobtrusive, suggests the continuing presence also of a presiding idea of which it is the momentary revelation.

The act as a whole gives, as I suggested, an impression of being planned; but there is no consistent carrying through of the plan as in the first and to some degree in the second. Apart from the fact that the first three scenes are much more closely grouped than those that follow and that the climax in the sixth scene seems only a sketch, falling far short of the expectation that has been raised in us, there is the strange and startling incursion made by the fifth scene. This scene has given the commentators more trouble than any other in the play. Professor Boas<sup>2</sup> long ago declared strongly in favour of Shakespeare's authorship of this scene and there does not seem any reason, in the light of what has been said since, to reject it. It is a fine Shakespearean scene: the difficulty lies not in its quality but in its function.<sup>3</sup> Apart from 'jottings' (of the kind we have already

<sup>1</sup> See III. iii, 37; iv, 26, 78; v, 119; vi, 78, 85, 90, 92. Also IV. i, 37; ii, 4, 41; iii, 26, 30, 71, 72, 104, 139, 389, 467, 488, 504-6, culminating in this last passage in Timon's speech to Flavius,

Forgive my general and exceptless rashness  
Ye perpetual-sober gods.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare and his Predecessors* (1896), pp. 502, 503.

<sup>3</sup> Commentators are not entirely agreed upon the quality of the scene and the proportion which they are willing to attribute to Shakespeare. T. M. Parrott (*op. cit.*) sees stronger evidence here of Chapman's hand than of Shakespeare's. But I think the majority of critics at the present day would give it to Shakespeare.

noticed twice) interwoven with the otherwise highly wrought verse, its condition could be called 'finished'. But to what purpose was it finished? Questions beset us as we read. What is this trial that is in progress? For whom is Alcibiades pleading? What has happened? And when? What has it to do with what goes before? Or, as we are presently in a position to ask, with what follows? It tumbles suddenly into the action with the bewildering inconsequence of an episode in a dream and its power and its vividness only strengthen this impression. Worse still, perhaps, they convince us that Shakespeare wrote this scene with considerable enthusiasm; he either cared enough about it to work over it until it was coherent and vigorous, or he came to it with a measure of artistic delight great enough to carry it through, clear and shapely, at the first writing.

Can we make any conjecture about this scene which will throw light not only on what is to follow, but upon the state of the whole play? Of many that have been made, one, I think, comes near to solving this dilemma of a scene characteristically Shakespearean in style which has hardly any relation to the main action of the play in which it appears.

Either, it is clear, the scene belongs to some alternative action or sub-plot which was finally discarded, in which case it has presumably strayed into the text as did, according to one theory, the re-written passages of *Love's Labour's Lost*, or it is an essential part of the action of the play as it was planned and its supporting scenes are lost or were never written. It may be noticed that, though it has as it stands no connection with the preceding action of the play, it has some kinship with the theme, for the changes are rung here, as all through the play, on the contrast between generous friendship and ingratitude. If it was a part of Shakespeare's design, nothing remains to confirm this or to show how it was to be related to the foregoing scenes except one or two hints in Alcibiades' speech (IV. iii, 94-5) and in the senators' embassy to Timon (V. i., especially 152-169) which suggest that it was Timon himself who had committed the murder and was the subject of the trial. This of course presupposes that a supporting scene or passage earlier in the act has been lost (or never written) as well as the necessary references that must have followed. But it does at least, if we can agree to it, clear away several difficulties. This scene, characteristically Shakespearean as it is in style, might, in that case, have been functional, taking up its place in the action of the play; the relation-



ship of Alcibiades to the rest of the play could thereupon become firm and coherent instead of disturbing us as it does by its inconclusiveness; the action of the final scenes of the play would take on a substance and a coherence that it badly lacks, and, in fact, the whole of Act V could be related to the main action. It becomes increasingly difficult to resist the idea that a series of passages is missing containing such essential parts of the story as would have made the structure of the last three acts solid by relating Timon clearly to Alcibiades and both to Athenian politics. Such an interpretation even offers us the possibility of a climax related to that of *Coriolanus* (a cognate play) reversing the choice and the direction taken by the action there.

The fourth act presents no such interruptions to the scheme of the play. There are several parts that we accept at sight, not only because their style bears the authentic marks of Shakespeare's workmanship, but also because they are related to the supposed plan of the whole (whose working-out is now, admittedly, becoming a little erratic). Timon's soliloquy in the first scene is one of these; it is, in addition, closely related to *Troilus and Cressida* (another cognate play) in thought and even in many details of its imagery. The second scene is less strongly characterized, but there is nothing in it actually suspicious; the broken verse is of the kind that is now familiar and the imagery is sometimes powerful. The allusions to 'the gods' that run like a thread through the later acts appear again and link it both with the third act and with the following scene. The last scene of this act is the most important in the play, as it stands, and there is no reason to suppose that it was not the climax in the design. The full working-out of the thought, fuller than in any other part, and the potency of the imagery, which is not only cogent and impressive, but significant of the main lines of thought throughout, convince me that here again we have something which is substantially Shakespeare's intention. It relates itself closely to *Troilus and Cressida* on the one hand and to *Lear* on the other, the two plays which seem to stand nearest to *Timon* in their mood and interpretation.

The fifth act is again uneven. So erratic is the relating of its parts that we sometimes feel as if we are reading a mixture of two different plays. Yet all through it<sup>1</sup> are the signs of mature writing which make

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the scene (iii.) of ten lines which achieves a degree of irrelevance unsurpassed even in this play, being incongruous in style and thought,

us hesitate to say that it has not been touched by Shakespeare.<sup>1</sup> Timon's speeches arise naturally out of what has gone before, but the sudden incursion of the senators<sup>2</sup> and their control of the final scenes is hardly related at all to the original design, and the matter here is not solid or potent enough to be the culmination of what has been so powerfully planned. Again, we are strongly tempted to assume some missing scenes grouped round and relating to III. v. which might have connected that scene with these, and these, thereby, to the whole plan. We cannot help, that is, the suspicion that the condition of the play is more than a matter of scenes that have not been worked over and a minor character, like the fool, who has not been clearly related. For from the middle of the third act there are major inconsistencies, most noticeable in the unexplained appearance of III. v, always involving Alcibiades and the Athenians and ending in the structural disjunction of the fifth act. As we have reason to believe that the plot was firmly designed, we can only assume that the design is not fairly represented by what remains.

If this were the end of the problem it would be a relatively simple one and there would, perhaps, be no need to re-state it. But we have avoided mention so far of the greatest weakness in the play, that which gives us more ground for uneasiness than all of these—the character of Timon.<sup>3</sup> This goes deep into the fabric of the play and we cannot explain it away by saying that something has been lost or not written or not worked-over. This is a matter of conception, not of working-out. For our complaint concerning Timon is not that we do not see enough of him, but that, in spite of the length of time during which he occupies the stage, he fails to leave a deep, coherent impression of his personality. And this is at its worst in the first two acts which we found no reason for supposing unfinished or unrepresentative of Shakespeare's intention regarding the central theme. Timon here is negative. There *is* no individuality. There is, it is true, a picture of great wealth and extravagant squandering, but this is not fit to support either so mighty a theme as is foreshadowed at the beginning, or a conversion such as the mood of the fourth

superfluous in the plot, and contradictory in the one matter (I. 3) which appears to offer some relationship with iv, 65-73. I make no claims upon this scene.

<sup>1</sup> Especially, perhaps, i, 144-233; ii, and iv.

<sup>2</sup> i, 121-233.

<sup>3</sup> I am aware that in what follows I join issue with Professor Wilson Knight (*The Wheel of Fire*), who, in his highly suggestive and subtle study of Timon, interprets him as a product of humanism and the 'flower of human aspiration'. I readily agree that this is what he well might have been, but I fail to detect the actual evidence in the play.

and fifth acts presuppose. We may say perhaps that we have there, after all, only one aspect of Timon. To which we may well be tempted to reply, Where, then, are the others? Extravagance was, it is true, a single aspect of certain magnificent figures dear to Elizabethan and Jacobean writers, the great Italian nobles of the Renaissance and their English equivalents, Wolsey, Raleigh, Essex. But Timon is not magnificent; magnificence presupposes other qualities also; power, purpose, the capacity for lofty if contaminated design, a wide variety of enthusiasms and richness of personality. Put Timon beside Alexander VI, Lorenzo di Medici, Henry VIII or Raleigh, and what loftiness of purpose, imagination or liberality is there in him? Put him beside Anthony or Lear and where is the splendour with which Shakespeare could, when he wished, invest a figure? The Timon of the first acts has little but extravagance and a kind of isolated self-assurance.

And this impression of negation and isolation is deepened, not dissipated, as we look closer. We do not know him and we do not know about him. Indeed, we begin to wonder whether he is not, himself, the greatest of the unrelated elements in the play. For he is only real by reason of his continual presence. Apart from that, he is hardly better built into his society on the grand scale than the fool is on a small scale. What, after all, do we know of his circumstances and relations, past and present, compared with all that we know or can divine of Hamlet, Lear or Coriolanus? If we begin to ask ourselves some of the questions to which Shakespeare generally provides unobtrusive answers, how many of them can we in fact answer? What is the source of his wealth; is it inherited or acquired? If inherited, how long has he had complete control of it? If acquired, by what means did he acquire it? Who were his parents and when did they die—if indeed they are dead? How long has he been an orphan—if he indeed is? Has he no blood relations? How and where was he brought up? If it was out of touch with courts, why are we not told so? If in the court, why is he so little aware of its pitfalls? How old is he? If he is very young, why has he not some of the characteristics of youth? Why, above all, is he not in love? If he is of mature age, why is he such a fool? And why again, in that case, does he bear no signs of the experience he must have met, above all, the acute knowledge of man that palace intrigue would have given to a strong intelligence? Shakespeare, who could reveal with such delicate discrimination the precise effect that the court of Cymbeline has had

on each personality that has come within its influence, did not lack the skill to do this for Timon, upon whose fortunes court-life is the determining influence.

Why, then, did Shakespeare, who elsewhere allows us to discover details of this kind, who builds a character into its society and uses those ties to reveal its operations, not do so here? Why did the poet who surrounded Hamlet in a web of circumstance give us this man who not only has no past but has no close connections in his present world, no parents, brothers, sisters, wife, mistress or friend? How can we imagine in Timon a man of strong and mature personality when he has no strong relationships in the present and shows no signs of their having moulded him in the past? And such a theme as this play seemed to design can only, we need hardly say, be imaged in a personality of the greatest power, the widest scope and the highest spirit and intelligence: his kinsmen, in the plays that lie nearest in mood, are, after all, Hamlet, Ulysses, Troilus, Lear.

Shakespeare may, it is true, have intended to throw the character into isolation, but it is hard to believe that, if he had, he would not have indicated this with a fulness and clarity that left no room for mistake in those two relatively finished early acts. Hamlet is isolated; it is a part of the play's design that he should be. But we know it beyond mistake and we know how it has come about. Moreover the people who contribute to it are themselves so deeply imagined and so clearly revealed that we see precisely what was the limitation in Gertrude, in Ophelia, in Horatio, in Laertes, in Rosencrantz, in Guildenstern, that frustrated communication. Regan, Goneril, Cornwall, again, have clear individuality to give weight and precision to their functions in the play. But unlike *Hamlet*, unlike *Lear*, the play of *Timon* does not endow its minor characters with the function of focusing, by their nature and actions, our thought and attention on the central figure.

Shakespeare's intention may not have been very near any of those that I have somewhat boldly indicated here. But to admit that is not to explain away the two great weaknesses in the structure that we have here suggested: that the character of Timon is inadequate to the theme and that the action does not knit together his fate and that of the other people in the play. We have no impression of greatness in Timon commensurate with the tragic experience of which he is apparently the responsible exponent, and we miss the familiar Shakespearean relating of character to society and circum-

stance which itself, in the Shakespearean system, gives rise to action. Yet, since all these weaknesses are to be found in scenes which in other ways seem part of an ordered design, we must suppose that we have here a character which has not been deeply imagined. Shakespeare, who could reveal with penetrating rapidity the individuality of Albany or even of the murderers in *Macbeth*, has here put before us at great length a character which, but for a few violent passions and harshly outlined traits, is colourless and neutral.

*Timon* is an unfinished play in a far deeper sense than that which is implied by saying Shakespeare left off writing before he had set down all that was in his mind. It is unfinished in this way also, it is true. But, what matters more, it is unfinished in conception. We can explain the broken verse and the loose ends easily; we can explain nearly as easily the imperfections of the plot; we can even isolate the main theme and show how unworthy of it is the working-out in the later acts. What we cannot explain is our impression that this play is indeed '*Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark', the character of Timon being often a blank. Here is that rarest of all weaknesses in Shakespeare's work, an element which is not wholly functional; a character which does not convince us, upon inspection, that, given its nature and these events, the resultant action presented to us is inevitable. Dare we suggest that, for some reason at which we can only dimly guess, Shakespeare chose the wrong character to support his theme, and, consequently, the wrong outer action as the image of the inner action? This obviously leaves us as far as ever from real knowledge of the cause of the play's collapse, but it may suggest one reason why it came to a standstill, was 'unfinished' in the more limited and technical sense also. How Shakespeare, with his unsurpassed artistic and psychological sureness, came to make so colossal a blunder is a matter on which we dare not conjecture. Were there other plays which also miscarried, which have not survived? Did this survive against his intention? All that we can say with any certainty is that here is a design not wholly comprehended and subdued by the shaping spirit of imagination.

## SIR JOHN BEAUMONT'S 'THE CROWNE OF THORNES'<sup>1</sup>

BY B. H. NEWDIGATE

From two passages in *Bosworth-field*, the posthumous collection of Sir John Beaumont's verse which his son John, heir to the baronetcy, brought out in 1629, we know that he had written a poem called 'The Crowne of Thornes'. He alludes to it himself in his 'Elegy on the Death of the Earl of Southampton', in which he writes of the kindly interest which the late Earl had taken in his poetry :

Shall euer I forget with what delight,  
He on my simple lines would cast his sight?  
His onely mem'ry my poore worke adorne,  
He is a Father to my crowne of thornes:  
Now since his death how can I euer looke,  
Without some teares, vpon that Orphan booke?  
Ye sacred Muses, if ye will admit  
My name into the roll, which ye haue writ  
Of all your seruants, to my thoughts display  
Some rich conceipt, some vnfrequented way,  
Which may hereafter to the world commend  
A picture fit for this my noble Friend:  
For this is nothing, all these Rimes I scorne;  
Let Pens be broken, and the paper torne:  
And with his last breath let my musick cease,  
Vnlesse my lowly Poem could increase  
In true description of immortall things,  
And rays'd aboue the earth with nimble wings,  
Fly like an Eagle from his Fun'rall fire,  
Admir'd by all, as all did him admire.<sup>2</sup>

From an allusion to the unpublished poem made by Sir Thomas Hawkins in the lines to 'his much honoured friend' printed among

<sup>1</sup> Most of the documentary evidence for the authorship of the poem which I have used here was collected by the late Louise Imogen Guiney for her *Recusant Poets*, of which the first series, published posthumously in 1938, contains a passage from the poem on page 254. It is printed below. Miss Guiney suspected Beaumont to be the author, but at her death in 1920 she left the question in doubt. In the account of Beaumont which is to be printed in the second series of *Recusant Poets* the authorship of 'The Crowne of Thornes' is assigned to him.

<sup>2</sup> *Bosworth-field*, pp. 178-9.



the commendatory poems in *Bosworth-field* it is clear 'The Crowne of Thornes' should rank as a major work:

Like to the Bee, thou didds't those Flow'rs select,  
That most the tastefull palate might affect,  
With pious relishes of things Diuine,  
And discomposed sence with peace combine.  
Which (in thy *Crowne of Thornes*) we may discerne,  
Fram'd as a Modell for the best to learne:  
That Verse may Vertue teach, as well as Prose,  
And minds with natiue force to Good dispose,  
Deuotion stirre, and quicken cold Desires,  
To entertaine the warmth of holy Fires.  
There may we see thy Soule expaciate,  
And with true feruor sweetly meditate  
Vpon our Sauours sufferings; that while  
Thou seek'st his painefull torments to beguile,  
With well-tun'd Accents of thy zealous Song,  
Breath'd from a soule transfix'd; a Passion strong,  
We better knowledge of his woes attaine,  
Fall into Teares with thee, and then againe,  
Rise with thy Verse to celebrate the Flood  
Of those eternall Torrents of his Blood.<sup>1</sup>

It has been supposed that the poem was lost. But 'The Crowne of Thornes' is the title of a long poem found in Additional MS. 33392 at the British Museum, and although the *Catalogue of Additional MSS.* ascribes it to another writer, there can be no doubt, I think, that it is Beaumont's poem. The *Catalogue* gives the following account of the manuscript and its contents:

Add. MS. 33392.

1. 'The Crowne of Thornes': a religious poem in rhymed heroic verse, in twelve books, beg.: 'I sing of thornes transform'd in bloody springs' fo. 1. Written in two different hands, the second beginning at fo. 85.

A work under this title (in eight books) was composed by Sir John Beaumont Bart. (ob. 1627), but no copy of it is known to have survived (see A. B. Grosart, *Poems of Sir J. Beaumont*, 1869, p. xxxij, and D.N.B. vol. iv, 1885, p. 59): as it was written in the lifetime of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton (ob. 1624), it cannot be identical with the present article, which was written (fo. 143)<sup>2</sup> after the marriage of Charles I (1625). For the probable author see below under art. 2.

2. A collection of *Latin* poems, mostly of a devotional or satirical character

<sup>1</sup> *Bosworth-field*, A5-A6.

<sup>2</sup> fo. 143. . . .

Expecting now a far securer life  
For thee our second Marie, vertuous wife  
of mighty Charles, and daughter of those kings  
by whose brave acts our Saviours lillie springs.

and with a strong anti-Protestant bias. Written in the same hand throughout and apparently *autograph*. ff. 146-190.

Included are:—Epigrams against Luther;—‘De stigmatibus S. Pauli et Calvinii’;—‘Compendium grammaticæ apostatum’;—Epitaphs on O. Cromwell and Qu. Elizabeth;—‘Logogryphus de cognomine meo’, *sc.* Clarke;—‘In obitum R. P. Petri Haliox’, *sc.* Pierre Halloix, Jesuit, of Liège (ob. 1656);—‘Conscientiæ scrupulosæ et cauteriatæ paradigma’;—‘Historia Puritani qui felim suspendit ob violatum Sabbatum mure capto’;—‘Domorum vel Carthusiani [*sic*] monachorum provinciæ hujus catalogus’;—‘An appetendus prioratus’, *etc.*;—‘Motiva humilitatis, ex S. Christi martyre R. P. Rob. Southwell’;—‘Meditationes Purgativæ’, *etc.* The writer was evidently Robert Clarke (*al.* Hauton *al.* Graine, a Carthusian monk, of Nieuport in Flanders (ob. 1675), whose *Christias*, a long Latin poem on the Passion (written before 1650) was published at Bruges 1670. In the preface to an edition by A. C. Walthier (Ingoldstadt 1855) it is stated (p. vij) that he also wrote an English poem, ‘The Crowne of Thornes’, existing in autograph in the library of Baron Edm. de Harold, circ. 1660.

In denying the authorship of ‘The Crowne of Thornes’ to Sir John Beaumont the writer of the above description rejects the evidence of a note written in a nineteenth-century hand on the cover of the volume:

The greater part of the book is probably in the handwriting of Francis Beaumont the Jesuit son of Sir John Beaumont who wrote the unprinted Crown of Thornes which occupies more than half the volume.

For the following reasons I believe that the above note is correct as to the authorship and that the catalogue of the Additional Manuscripts is wrong. For a careful reading of the passage in the Elegy to Southampton which I have quoted above suggests that Beaumont’s ‘The Crowne of Thornes’ was still unfinished at the date of the Earl’s death, when the Elegy was written. The poet in his grief is tempted to desist from writing more:

with his last breath let my musick cease,  
Vnlesse my lowly Poem could increase  
In true description of immortall things . . . .

But there is no reason to suppose that it did not afterwards ‘increase’ with the addition of new books, bringing the total number up to the twelve which are found in the manuscript. The allusion to the royal marriage comes in the twelfth book, very near the end of the poem.

Walthier’s quite unsupported statement that Robert Clarke, the author of ‘*Christias*’, had also written an English poem called ‘The Crowne of Thornes’, is of no great value. The manuscript at the British Museum may indeed be the same as that to which he alludes

as then 'existing in the library of Baron Edm. de Harold', for nothing seems to be known concerning its history prior to its purchase by the Museum from Quaritch in July 1888. It is described in the following notes, which were addressed to the late Louise Imogen Guiney by Mr. D. T. B. Wood of the British Museum, 9 August, 1919:

Add. MS. 33392.

Purchased of Quaritch 11 July, 1888.

ff. 1-84b.

The first six books of the 'Crown of Thorns' and part of the seventh book, in a neat copyist's hand without alterations.

ff. 85-145.

Part of the seventh book up to the end of the twelfth book, in a different hand, probably that of the author, as the alterations could hardly be made by anyone else, *e.g.*

{           dry  
  {from *greene* <sup>1</sup> thornes.  
          through Adam's *fall* fault.  
          we are to creatures *tied* bound.  
  {his masters  
  {*our Saviours* law.  
  {sharpe  
  {*theire* brambles on his head.  
          what steppes ascending soules *delight* invite.  
  {           seale  
  {to *unclaspe* the booke.  
          various *flowers* dowers.  
  {           light  
  {could drawe to *earth*  
  {           doe stand  
  {in severed troopes *attend*.  
          the sheepe amid soft *pastures* grasse in pastures red.  
  {           workeing.  
  {and cease *theire motion*.

ff. 146-190b.

miscellaneous Latin verses in the hand of Robert Clarke, Carthusian monk of Nieuport.

<sup>1</sup> The cancelled words are here printed in italic and the substituted words are printed either above or after them.

I do not know whose hand makes the assertion about Francis Beaumont on the cover, but the date at which it was made is certainly in the latter part of the 19th cent.

---

The Harold family are a Bavarian family.

Baron Edmund von Harold was Colonel Commander of the Regiment of Konigsfeld, Gentleman of the Bedchamber of the Elector Palatine, Member of the German Society of Man[n]heim, and of the Royal Antiquarian Society of London, and of the Academy of Dusseldorf. He published at Dusseldorf in 1787, in English, so-called Poems of Ossian lately discovered. I do not know if the library is broken up.

---

The second hand in the volume is certainly in the first half of the 17th cent.

---

As the hand changes at the foot of a page half way through the seventh book, this poem can hardly be Sir John Beaumont's 'Crown of Thorns' in 8 books extended to 12.

Nor can it be by Robert Clarke, whose hand is the third in the volume, unless both hands in the 'Crown of Thorns' are those of copyists.

---

There is nothing to connect this volume with Baron Edmund von Harold; but, in the face of Walthier's assertion, it is possible that he was speaking of this volume and was misled by the occurrence of Robert Clarke's poems at the end into asserting that the whole volume was by him.

---

It seems likely that whoever wrote the note on the cover of the codex was better informed than Walthier about the authorship of 'The Crowne of Thornes'. He knew something about the Beaumont family as well as about Sir John's writings, and it is possible that he had good grounds for saying that the first part of the poem is in the hand of his Jesuit son. If so, the composition of the poem seems to have been interrupted at the middle of the seventh book—perhaps at the time of Southampton's death. When it was resumed, Beaumont may have used this transcript of what he had already written, continuing and finishing it in his own hand.

The twelve books are all written in the heroic couplet used in *Bosworth-field*, to which it has been found to bear some likeness in other ways also.

Here are two passages from the poem, which opens with an invocation of the angelic powers:

You powerfull spirits moving heavenly sphaeres  
Whose aequall circles guide the sliding yeares  
You syrens whom the springs of light inspire  
Whose songs keepe tune with every dancing fire

Whom sitting on their orbes each planet feels  
 Whose musique drives their ever-turning wheelles  
 Whom rude antiquity could blindly view  
 And when the eightfold course of heaven she knew  
 Conceiving some ninth power whose generall might  
 Should rule the quire and keepe the concord right  
 Or, adding to those eight cœlestiall strings  
 The ninth base sphaere of sublunary things,  
 She hence the nine Aonian sisters made  
 Of your nine Orders an unperfect shade,  
 From your high seates some quickning influence send  
 Which falling on my heart may it extend  
 Beyond all formes which sides and corners bound  
 And cast my thoughts into a spacious round  
 To see my Saviour in this sphaere divine,  
 And trace the Sonne in his ecliptick line.

The following lines on Mary Queen of Scots are taken from the twelfth book :

Among those queenes who decke their royall stemmes  
 on earth with pearles, in heaven with richer gemmes,  
 shall wee forget one glorie of the north,  
 Triumphant Marye, who dispersing forth  
 her beames from snowie Calidonian hills,  
 this happie Ile with princely ofspring fills ;  
 while two large realmes, united in her sonne,  
 laments the wronges which they to her have done ;  
 when Scotland cload in walls her freeborne breath,  
 and England stood astonisht att her death.  
 The bloud which shee from kingly vaines receivd  
 confirmed that faith, to which her parents cleavd.  
 The miners of Gods house distroyd this wall ;  
 and joynd her murder to our churches fall ;  
 but hee who firmnesse to his rocke imparts,  
 erects new temples in religious hearts ;  
 as hee hath changd her short, and earthly raigne  
 for heavenly crownes, which noe foule hand can staine ;  
 soe though with us material churches faile,  
 Devotion lives and shall, at last, prevaile.<sup>1</sup>

Whether or no Robert Clarke ever wrote 'The Crowne of Thornes', which the British Museum Catalogue and Walthierer alike ascribe to him (though it is unlikely that two poets, who were also contemporaries, should each have written a lengthy poem with that title), as the author of 'Christias' he deserves at least a passing notice. His name

<sup>1</sup> Printed in *Recusant Poets*, I, p. 254.

occurs again and again in the Diary of the English College at Douay.<sup>1</sup> It is recorded there that 'Robertus Hautonus, sive Groyneus (hic Clarke) Londinensis'<sup>2</sup> was tonsured with thirty-six more on 7 June, 1620. On 20 August, 1622, being then in his first year of theology, he set out for England for the sake of his health. He was back in September, and on 1 October was appointed master of the class of Poetry, which he continued to teach in 1623. He was appointed to teach the Rhetoricians in 1624. He received minor orders on 21 December in the latter year. On 19 October, 1627, he is mentioned as teaching the Gregorian chant to the students. He was ordained priest on 28 March, 1628, and sang his first mass on Ladyday following. In October he was once more appointed to teach Poetry. In the following year he was teaching Rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> On 16 July, 1629, there was performed in the refectory a tragi-comedy, composed by him on the reign of the Emperor Otho, 'quæ auditoribus plurimum placuit', and on 13 September another play, on the return from exile of St. Ignatius of Antioch. On 19 September the Diary records his departure to England, saying of him that 'non solum in humanioribus litteris (quas per aliquot annos laudabiliter docuit) verum etiam in Philosophia ac Theologia est doctus et eruditus.' On 16 June, 1632, he returned to the College with the intention of entering the Carthusian Order, and he left it on 8 July to join the English Carthusians at Nieuport in Flanders, where he took the habit on 15 August, 1633. He died there in 1675.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Third Douay Diary*, Catholic Record Soc., 1911, *passim*. See index, under 'Hawton'.

<sup>2</sup> That means only that he came from the diocese of London. In the Diary the name Hautonus is found once only. The alternative family name is variously rendered Groyneus, Groyineus, Grayineus, Grayeneus, Grainerus, Grayneus, Graineus, and Groney. Clarke was an alias.

<sup>3</sup> Poetry and Rhetoric are still the two highest schools or classes in the school course at Stonyhurst and some other English colleges which were founded overseas in penal times.

<sup>4</sup> Hendricks, *The London Charterhouse*, 1889, p. 322.



## JONSON'S MASQUES:

### A REJOINDER<sup>1</sup>

BY EVELYN M. SIMPSON

ALL true scholars must be grateful to Dr. Greg for the immense learning and industry and the unfaltering integrity shown in all his reviews. We ourselves are immensely indebted to him for the various items of new information which he has contributed in his reviews of our edition, as well as for the generosity with which from time to time he has privately communicated to us some fresh piece of evidence. As an example of the constructive criticism which we value highly, I would instance his discussion of our treatment of *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*.<sup>2</sup> He recognizes that we have made 'a valiant attempt' to perform the most difficult task of sorting out the versions of the three performances, at Burley, at Belvoir, and at Windsor. He admits that he is 'not sure that the evidence is sufficient for a final solution', and then contributes some masterly criticism and suggestions. All such suggestions must be carefully considered for discussion in the commentary on the Masques which we hope to publish in Volume X, and I have no doubt that we shall accept a number of them.

The most important general criticism which Dr. Greg has to make about Volume VII of the Oxford *Jonson* is that our choice of a basic text for the thirty-seven masques and entertainments which it contains has not been sufficiently logical and consistent. 'It will be seen that there is a good deal of diversity, and some apparent inconsistency, in the editors' treatment of the original texts. This no doubt lends variety and perhaps bibliographical interest to their edition: but I should have welcomed some more explicit discussion of the principles that have governed their procedure, or at least some recognition of the fact that there are critical principles involved' (pp. 148, 149). I am glad to take up this challenge, and to explain what were the principles which governed our choice, for in fact we were guided by

<sup>1</sup> See W. W. Greg, 'Jonson's Masques—Points of Editorial Principle and Practice', *R.E.S.*, XVIII., April, 1942, pp. 144-166.

<sup>2</sup> *R.E.S.*, XVIII., 154-8.

principles, and not by the 'emotional considerations' which Dr. Greg thinks that he can detect.

This volume with its miscellaneous contents, ranging from *The King's Entertainment* (1604) to *Love's Welcome at Bolsover* (1634), presents an entirely different problem from that of Volume V, for example. There we could be, and were, perfectly consistent. The four plays contained in the volume were all written within a few years of one another, were all printed in quarto, and were all contained in the 1616 Folio, issued when Jonson was still almost at the height of his powers. We selected the Folio text as the basis of our own, and though we have been attacked for this by Dr. de Vocht, we have the solid satisfaction of knowing that Dr. Greg has approved of our choice. On the other hand, in Volume VII we were dealing with pieces of which nineteen appeared in the Folio of 1616, seventeen in the far less authoritative Folio of 1640-1, and one is derived solely from the Newcastle manuscript. A number had previously appeared in quarto, and four of them are extant in seventeenth-century manuscripts.

The question whether an editor should prefer the quarto or folio version of any particular masque is not an easy one to answer. For the masques which were first printed in quarto, and then re-issued in the 1616 Folio, we have followed our previous practice of regarding that Folio as the ultimate authority for Jonson's text. To this there is one exception, *The Masque of Queens*, for which we have preferred the autograph manuscript specially written for Prince Henry in Jonson's clear and beautiful hand. Dr. Greg approves our choice of this manuscript, but with regard to the other masques he thinks that we should have based our text on the quartos rather than on the Folio. 'The only excuse for following the folio (whether of 1616 or 1641) is that the text shows signs of having been touched up before it was reprinted. But the changes made were sporadic and could easily have been introduced into a text based on the quarto' (p. 145). I believe that at the beginning of our work on this volume I light-heartedly suggested that we should adopt the quarto text wherever one was available, but collation soon convinced me that this was not practicable throughout, though it is arguable that in particular cases we should have done better to choose the quarto. As far as the 1616 Folio is concerned, we were at any rate consistent, and it seems a little hard that in this connection Dr. Greg should write, 'constancy on this occasion appears a doubtful virtue' (p. 145).

The most noteworthy instance of the superiority of a folio text over a quarto is to be found in *The Masque of Augurs*, though Dr. Greg strangely suggests that we should have based our text on the quarto. Here, if anywhere in this volume, the Folio text has been deliberately revised and enlarged. Not only does the quarto lack the long ballad of John Urson (ll. 165-225), and the elaborate Latin commentary on augury—a characteristic piece of Jonsonian learning—but there are a number of less important passages where the folio text is definitely superior. There are the three lines of satire on court officials (ll. 34-6) contained in the folio, but missing in the quarto, and the changes in l. 128 where the folio has 'and a bumbard of broken beere' but the quarto has only 'and a bumbard', and l. 142 where Slug says in the quarto 'very sufficient Beares, as any are in the Ground' and the Folio adds 'the *Parish-Garden*', i.e. Paris Garden, the home of the tame bears. I cannot understand why, in the teeth of this evidence, which we supplied in our introduction to the masque, Dr. Greg should speak of 'the superior quarto text'. It is true that the quarto has fewer misprints than the folio, and that sometimes we have followed its punctuation, as in ll. 140, 143, 157, and other places, all of which have been recorded in the critical apparatus. These, however, are but minor details, and our text is substantially that of the folio. If we had based it on the quarto, we should have had to supply an enormous amount of material from the folio, and should have had to botch and patch our text in the most uncritical way.

Dr. Greg approves our choice of the Chatsworth manuscript for *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, and of the Heber-Huntington manuscript for *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*, but he thinks that we might with advantage have based our text of *Christmas his Masque* on the Folger manuscript. We considered this course, and deliberately rejected it on the following grounds. The Folger manuscript leaves out the descriptions of the characters, their dresses and properties, which we should have had to supply from the Folio. It has also a number of peculiar forms which we know to be un-Jonsonian, such as 'tow' for 'two' (ll. 72, 94, 216), 'troa' for 'tro'a' (l. 137), 'hoopid' for 'hooped' (l. 187), and the curious use of a grave accent on 'a' as the indefinite article, as 'à Torch-bearer' (l. 89), 'à Sonne' (l. 148), or of an apostrophe before the same article, as 'Sauce for 'a Coney' (l. 182), 'and 'a dozen' (l. 238). On p. 153 Dr. Greg writes 'May not this peculiarity, which I do not remember to have met elsewhere, be

due to a misunderstanding of Jonson's use of an accent on "a" when it is *not* the article, as in *The Masque of Queens* ("Cat-à-Mountain", "is now à turning", "à-sleepe", etc.)? If so it would indicate transcription from an autograph'. This seems to me an extraordinary way of establishing transcription from an autograph. Jonson never used an accent on 'a' as the indefinite article, but employed it occasionally when 'a' represented an older 'on' or 'of'. The scribe of the Folger manuscript did something which Jonson never did, so he must have been copying Jonson's autograph! I can imagine how caustic Dr. Greg's comment would have been if we had followed this line of argument. However, there can be no doubt that the Folger manuscript and the folio text are independent of one another, and that each on occasion corrects the other, as Dr. Greg remarks. At l. 110 we have had to insert three lines from the manuscript, but this is a much slighter addition than the forty lines of description (ll. 30-70) which we should have had to insert from the folio if we had based our text on the manuscript. In such a case an editor must weigh the merits of one text against the other, and we can at any rate claim that our decision was made after due and careful consideration.

Dr. Greg closed his attack on our lack of critical principles with the words: 'As it is, one gets the impression, perhaps a quite erroneous impression, that the grounds of their choice have been what I may perhaps describe as emotional (reverence for the "sacrosanct" holograph, the "unique" manuscript) rather than rational'. It may, therefore, be convenient if I sum up what our practice has been:—

(1) In the only instance where an autograph manuscript of Jonson's was available (*The Masque of Queens*) we have reproduced it in its entirety.

(2) For all other pieces found in the 1616 Folio we have followed the practice of our earlier volumes in making the folio text the basis of our own.

(3) The Folio of 1640 has no such authority as the 1616 Folio possesses. We have considered each masque in it as a separate problem. In two cases we have preferred a manuscript to the Folio: in one case, after weighing the merits of each text, we have preferred the Folio to the manuscript. Where the folio text showed definite revision of the quarto, as in *The Masque of Augurs*, we have preferred the folio. Where, as in *Neptune's Triumph* and *Chloridia*, we could find no sign of revision, we have preferred the quarto.

On page 160 Dr. Greg brings up all his heavy artillery against our

use of conical brackets to mark the insertion of necessary words or letters which were not found in the text which we have chosen as the basis of each particular masque. He actually states, 'I should like to submit that it is the duty of a critical editor to take the responsibility for such additions to and omissions from the copy-text as he feels compelled to make, as well as for other alterations, without disfiguring the page for the reader'. Here there can be no surrender. Even Dr. Greg shall not persuade me to give up my right as an editor to inform the reader by brackets of any kind that I have been obliged to make an interpolation in the text. Our particular use of conical and square brackets is not an invention of our own. It goes back to that great scholar, Ingram Bywater, and it has been fully tested in the series of volumes known as *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*. When Dr. Greg calls it 'unseemly', and says that our use of it 'offends the æsthetic sense', he is wandering into realms of taste where I have no intention of following him. Such a question is, of course, quite distinct from his other point, 'how far the bracketed additions are really necessary'. Here we are on much more debatable ground, and we are quite ready to admit that we may perhaps have inserted an elided vowel before the metrical apostrophe more often than we need have done. I feel, however, that we can make out a good case for a number of the insertions. Did Dr. Greg really want us to print 'b'vn-altered law' instead of 'b(y) 'vn-altered law' on p. 486 of Vol. VII? If we have been unduly careful in supplying elided vowels, we have done so in the belief that we were following Jonson's own practice as set forth in the chapter 'Of Apostrophus' in his *English Grammar*. From this chapter Dr. Greg produces 'Th'outward man', and 'If ye 'utter' as contrasted examples of Jonson's two forms of elision, both indicated by an apostrophe, but one omitting and one retaining the elided vowel. He fails, however, to make the natural deduction that we are justified in not inserting the elided 'e' of 'the' and equally justified in inserting the 'e' of 'ye' to avoid such monstrosities as 'y 'have' and the like. As an example of inconsistency he quotes the fact that we have allowed 'the'Elysian' and 'Th'Elysian' of the Folio to stand without interference in consecutive lines on p. 194. If we had altered either of these, it would surely have been an additional example of the 'fussy interference' with which he reproaches us. If we are not completely consistent in our practice, we are merely following the example of Jonson himself, who allowed a certain amount of freedom in this matter. On the other hand, I think

that Dr. Greg is right in suggesting that we should have accompanied our printing of "<h> em' on p. 721 by altering 'em' to '<h> em' on pp. 26, 465, 481. The autograph of the *Masque of Queens* shows that 'hem', not 'em', was Jonson's usual form.

I will now turn to a few points of more detailed criticism. On p. 149 Dr. Greg remarks on *Mortimer*: 'The note at the end of the fragment is in some copies "Hee dy'd, and left it unfinished", in others merely "Left unfinished". Is there any ground for the assertion that the latter is the earlier?' In our short introduction we suggested a reason for the assertion—that in the copies which contain the fuller form, the note is irregularly printed, the words 'Hee dy'd, and left it' being not in line with 'unfinished'. Such irregular printing generally affords evidence that a line has been tampered with. And was the printer more likely to take out the words 'Hee dy'd and', or to fill in the abrupt 'Left unfinished'?

On p. 153 Dr. Greg asks: 'I wonder what power of divination enables the editors to be certain that a cancelled reading at l. 72 in the Newcastle manuscript is what "Jonson originally wrote" and not a mere slip of the scribe's'. Perhaps we expressed ourselves too positively, but the grounds of our assertion were two-fold—first, that the change of 'all the yeare' to 'all, two there' is not one that a scribe would be likely to make, and secondly that this particular scribe was a very careful copyist.

In a note on p. 148 Dr. Greg questions our statement that in *The Masque of Queens*, l. 284, 'Jonson should have written "confudit"'. 'Confudit murmura' is the unquestioned reading in the passage from Lucan (VI. 686) which Jonson is quoting. How would Dr. Greg translate 'confudit murmura', which is what Jonson wrote? 'Dug murmurs thoroughly' or 'stabbed' them? On the other hand, he is right about the quantity of 'confudit'.

As to *The Golden Age Restored*, Dr. Greg remarks 'The order of the final speeches was altered in the course of printing. The editors assert that the state in which Astræa's verses come at the end is the later. Is there any ground for this beyond their opinion that it is preferable from a literary point of view?' Bibliography fails us here, and we thought that we had sufficient warrant for our statement, 'The change must have been made by the author for literary reasons'. That Astræa, returning to the earth which she had forsaken, should come back and decide to remain because she found James upon the throne, is a characteristic piece of Jonsonian flattery, and the



'Galliards and Corantos' close the piece with a dance, as in *The Vision of Delight*, *Pleasure Reconci'd to Virtue*, *The Masque of Augurs*, *Neptune's Triumph*, *The Fortunate Isles*, *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, and *Chloridia*. As editors we were obliged to choose one of the two arrangements, and if Dr. Greg prefers the arrangement found in certain copies, by which the masque closes with a speech by Pallas and a couplet sung by the Choir, he should produce some argument in favour of it to counter those which I have mentioned to support our choice. In fact, though Dr. Greg courteously refers on p. 144 to the care that we have devoted to our task, and our 'paramount authority on all matters touching Jonson's text', he is curiously unwilling to allow us to make any positive statement about it. On p. 159 he questions our removal of *The Masque of Owls* from among the masques to a place among the entertainments. He admits that it 'is not a masque in the technical sense', as it lacks the dances and songs, which belong to the masque proper. We considered that there was a clear gain in removing it from the place which it occupied in the 1640 Folio between *Neptune's Triumph* and *The Fortunate Isles*. The second of these is a resetting of the former, which was not performed on the occasion for which it had been written, and the juxtaposition of the two pieces is clearly desirable. Moreover, *The Masque of Owls* was performed at Kenilworth, and it suits better with the *Entertainment at the Blackfriars*, and the Welbeck and Bolsover entertainments, than with the more formal and elaborate masques performed at Whitehall. Dr. Greg objects that we have not removed *Prince Henry's Barriers* and *A Challenge at Tilt* to a place among the entertainments, but there were reasons for retaining these in their original position. *Prince Henry's Barriers* precedes *Oberon*, which was also written for Prince Henry, and *A Challenge at Tilt*, like *The Irish Masque* which follows it, was written for the Somerset marriage festivities. Moreover, these belong to the 1616 Folio, and therefore we may assume that Jonson approved the arrangement, whereas no such authority can be claimed for the 1640 Folio, which actually places the Welbeck and Bolsover entertainments among the poems of *The Underwood*.

This leads me to Dr. Greg's cavil on p. 159: 'I notice that the editors still speak of *The Underwoods* in the plural, in spite of what seems to me the convincing arguments advanced by Mr. B. H. Newdigate in favour of the singular form of this collective name, on the analogy of *The Forest* and *Timber* (or *Discoveries*)'. We agree that

Mr. Newdigate's arguments are sound, and have adopted the corrected title in the manuscript of our eighth volume now deposited at the Clarendon Press. We had also worked out the bibliographical confirmation set forth in Dr. Greg's note on p. 160. It should be noted, however, that our references in the present volume (pp. 53, 433, 789, 806) are quite incidental, and allude to the section of the 1640 Folio which has the title-page *Vnder-woods*. In view of the fact that in Volume II of our edition Professor Herford had consistently spoken of the later poems as *Underwoods*, it seemed better to defer any change in our practice till we could explain the reasons for our adoption of the corrected title.

Dr. Greg has scored a palpable hit in his discussion of the date of *Pan's Anniversary*. We accept his arguments, derived from Brotanek, in favour of June 19, 1620, in place of January 17 of the same year. The arrangement by which we have placed the masque after *News from the New World* is therefore correct, but our statement on p. 528 needs alteration, which we hope to supply in a later volume.

On p. 159 Dr. Greg queries one of our statements about the publication of the masques. 'That Walkley was "The true owner of the copyright" of all the later masques is perhaps too confident a statement'. If Walkley was not the owner, why was he able to publish *The Masque of Augurs*, *Time Vindicated*, *Neptune's Triumph*, and *Pan's Anniversary*, which Crooke and Sergier, in league with Benson, had registered at Stationers' Hall on March 20, 1640? Walkley, in a petition to the House of Lords in 1648, stated that 'about 6 yeares ago' he 'bought a peece of Poetry of Mr. Ben: Johnsons which cost him 40<sup>l</sup>, and printed it by Authority'. He petitioned that this should be 'relicensed'. In this connection we may note that Dr. Greg also criticises (p. 156) our mention of Benson's dishonesty. But this seems a reasonable deduction from the fact that Walkley obtained an injunction from one of the Secretaries of State, prohibiting Benson, who had entered on the Stationers' Register the *Art of Poetry* and *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*, as well as Crooke and Sergier who had entered the four masques mentioned above, 'from further printing or publishing the same works or any of them'.<sup>1</sup>

There is one feature of Dr. Greg's successive reviews of our edition which remains constant—his animus against Jonson and,

<sup>1</sup> See the petition to the Lord Keeper printed in *The Library*, 1930-1, Vol. XI., pp. 225-9.

from time to time, against ourselves when we venture to accept Jonson's statements. Thus on p. 153 he suggests that 'the editors preferred to draw a veil over the disingenuousness of Jonson's explanation'. This is merely an incidental remark; much more serious was his attack on Jonson in a previous review which we had no opportunity to answer. 'The editors echo his [*i.e.* Jonson's] querulous complaints; perhaps with more loyalty to Ben than fairness to Beale'. And later, 'But perhaps the real trouble was that Beale did not pay sufficient attention to Jonson's directions, and was impatient of his meticulous and probably dilatory habits'.<sup>1</sup> In our textual introductions<sup>2</sup> to *Bartholomew Fair*, *The Devil is an Ass*, and *The Staple of News* we produced evidence of Beale's gross incompetence. Surely Jonson was justified in his complaints against a printer who disfigured his work with such blemishes as 'thhe landed', 'Hld', 'mmy breakfast', 'ænd' (for 'and'), 'meetingy' (for 'meetings'), 'Vices' (for 'Vices'), 'miny' (for 'mine'), 'oe' (for 'of'), 'my in mouth', and many others. Ben, old and bed-ridden with palsy, was unable to attend at the printing-house day by day to look through his proofs, as was the habit of many seventeenth-century authors. Apparently he succeeded in obtaining and correcting a few proofs, but for the most part the errors which so vexed him had to stand. Beale was not only a careless printer, but he had the effrontery to advise his readers, in his preface to Gouge's *The whole-Armor of God*, if they were puzzled by the mistakes and misprints in their own copy, to collate it with other copies on the off-chance of finding some corrections. After all, Ben was a great dramatist, and since we find a wealth of evidence against Beale, all of which we recorded in our critical apparatus of the three plays above-mentioned, we may fairly argue that in disputing the charges, the 'querulousness' belongs to Dr. Greg and not to Ben or ourselves. I feel a certain unholy satisfaction in noting how often, throughout his review, Dr. Greg dwells on our moral and æsthetic failings rather than on genuine editorial blunders. I know enough of his lynx-eyed scrutiny to be sure that if our text had been inaccurate as a whole throughout the eight hundred odd pages of this volume, he would have had no space to spare in which to deplore our supposed undue tenderness to Jonson, our 'fussiness' in inserting ugly brackets, our 'emotional' reverence for Jonson's holograph, and the like.

In conclusion, may I add a word of personal appreciation? More

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.*, XIV, 344-5.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. VI, 6-8, 149, 274.

than thirty years ago Dr. Greg gave me my first informal instruction in bibliography in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. I have never ceased to be grateful for what I learnt from him then, and he has added to the debt by the suggestive comments and useful corrections which he has made on several pages of this last review. I am delighted to find that he shares with us the belief that this volume of masques contains 'much of Jonson's most pleasing verse', and that the critical problems contained in it are both varied and exciting. In it we have had to do much more pioneer work than in our previous volumes, and if we have not always been successful in dealing with the difficulties which have arisen, we have at least blazed a trail for others to follow.

## HENRY VAUGHAN AND 'HERMES TRISMEGISTUS'

BY L. C. MARTIN

In 1614, seven or eight years before the birth of Henry and Thomas Vaughan, the origin and date of the Hermetic books had been determined with considerable accuracy by Isaac Casaubon. Before the publication in that year of his *Exercitationes XVI* it had been generally believed that the Libelli represented the deliverances of the Egyptian god Thoth, named Hermes by the Greeks, that they were written at about the time of Moses, and that they were the foundation on which Pythagoras and later teachers had built the fabric of Greek philosophy. Casaubon ascribed the Hermetic writings to the first century of the Christian era, thus antedating them, but by no more than one or two hundred years, and justly pronounced them to be 'in part' of Platonist derivation. He might have said 'almost wholly', for his further association of them with Christian doctrine has not been substantiated and it can now be taken as established that their authors were pagan Greeks resident in Egypt under the Roman Empire, or Egyptians who had come under the influence of Greek culture.<sup>1</sup>

But the old suppositions were not immediately and universally dispelled and it was still possible for Thomas Vaughan to imply, in one of his fairly numerous references to the *Hermetica*, that they faithfully reflected the theology of ancient Egypt;<sup>2</sup> and they could thus be made to lend the support of pristine and almost sacred authority to the very questionable compound of theosophy, alchemy, astrology and natural magic which Thomas Vaughan offered a heedless world in a jargon of professional terminology. Henry Vaughan, on the other hand, who mentions the Hermetic writings but once, and then in a translation, had studied them apparently with care and certainly with imaginative profit; and may well seem to have been better employed than his brother in giving new poetic life to some of the Hermetic notions without as a rule unduly per-

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Walter Scott's discussion in his edition of the *Hermetica* (1924), vol. 1, pp. i-iii.

<sup>2</sup> In *Magia Adamica* (1650), *Works*, ed. A. E. Waite (1919), p. 179.

plexing, by his terms or his contexts, the mind of the common reader. It is not intended here to estimate the varying merit of these poetic transmutations but merely to point out certain loci in which the Hermetic influence is either manifest or probable and also to show that the Hermetic writings occasionally throw some light upon the poet's meaning.

Perhaps the clearest instance of his indebtedness is supplied by a passage in '*The importunate Fortune, written to Doctor Powell of Cantre*' (*Thalia Rediviva*, 1678, pp. 614-17).<sup>1</sup> The argument is to the effect that Vaughan's speculative and visionary gifts enable him to despise worldly affluence and to soar into a heaven of spiritual well-being. As he rises he casts off the impedimenta of human frailty and leaves them in the spheres to which they belong:

First my dull Clay I give unto the *Earth*,  
Our common Mother, which gives all their birth.  
My growing Faculties I send as soon  
Whence first I took them, to the humid *Moon*.  
All Subtilties and every cunning Art  
To witty *Mercury* I do impart.  
Those fond affections which made me a slave  
To handsome Faces, *Venus* thou shalt have.  
And saucy Pride (If there was ought in me)  
*Sol*, I return it to thy Royalty.  
My daring Rashness and Presumptions be  
To *Mars* himself an equal Legacy.  
My ill-placed Avarice (sure 'tis but small;)  
*Jove*, to thy Flames I do bequeath it all.  
And my false *Magic*, which I did believe,  
And mystic Lyes to *Saturn* I do give.  
My dark Imaginations rest you there,  
This is your grave and Superstitious Sphære.

Apart from the first two lines quoted here this is clearly based upon the following passage from Libellus I ('The Poimandres') describing the processes which succeed the dissolution of the material body:

And thereupon the man mounts upward through the structure of the heavens. And to the first zone of heaven he gives up the force which works increase and that which works decrease; to the second zone, the machinations of evil cunning; to the third zone, the lust whereby men are deceived; to the fourth zone, domineering arrogance; to the fifth zone, unholy daring and rash audacity; to the sixth zone, evil strivings after wealth; and to the seventh zone, the falsehood which lies in wait to work harm (p. 129).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The page-numbers refer to my edition of Vaughan's *Works* (1914).

<sup>2</sup> The translations are those of Mr. Walter Scott, *op. cit.*, vol. I, to which the page-numbers given refer. I follow also his numbering and arrangement of the Libelli.



The several association of these various human tendencies with the Moon, Venus, Mars and the rest is of course not peculiar, but it would probably be difficult to find a closer parallel to this elaboration of the doctrine than Vaughan has supplied.

In the lines which follow in Vaughan's poem he is no doubt indebted to the corresponding Hermetic passage, but apparently had other passages also in mind.

Get up my disentangled Soul, thy fire  
Is now refin'd & nothing left to tire,  
Or clog thy wings. Now my auspicious flight  
Hath brought me to the *Empyrean* light.  
I am a sep'rate *Essence*, and can see  
The *Emanations* of the Deitie,  
And how they pass the Seraphims, and run  
Through ev'ry *Throne* and *Domination*.  
So rushing through the Guard, the Sacred streams  
Flow to the neighbour Stars, and in their beams  
(A glorious Cataract!) descend to Earth  
And give Impressions unto ev'ry birth.  
With Angels now and Spirits I do dwell.  
And here it is my Nature to do well,  
Thus, though my Body you confined see,  
My boundless thoughts have their *Ubiquitie*.

The Hermetic writer continues thus :

And thereupon, having been stripped of all that was wrought upon him by the structure of the heavens, he ascends to the substance of the eighth sphere, being now possessed of his own proper power; and he sings, together with those that dwell there, hymning the Father; and they that are there rejoice with him at his coming. And being made like to those with whom he dwells, he hears the Powers, who are a substance of the eighth sphere, singing praise to God with a voice that is theirs alone.

The two passages are similar in outline and in one or two details but some further citations will suggest that other Hermetic conceptions were at this juncture fused in the processes of Vaughan's imagination :

(a) Libellus XI (ii), p. 221, on the soul's powers to transcend in thought the limits of space :

Bid it fly up to heaven, and it will have no need of wings; nothing can bar its way, neither the fiery heat of the sun, nor the swirl of the planet-spheres; cleaving its way through all, it will fly up till it reaches the outermost of all corporeal things. And should you wish to break forth from the universe itself, and gaze on the things outside the Kosmos (if indeed there is anything outside the Kosmos), even that is permitted to you.

(b) Libellus V, p. 161, where the drift is much the same:

Would that it were possible for you to grow wings and soar into the air! Poised between earth and heaven, you might see the solid earth, the fluid sea and the streaming rivers, the wandering air, the penetrating fire, the courses of the stars, and the swiftness of the movement with which heaven encompasses all.

(c) Libellus X, p. 203, the apparent source of Vaughan's thoughts about 'Emanations' and their effects upon 'ev'ry birth':

The divine forces operate by means of the Kosmos, and their operation reaches man by means of the cosmic radiations to which birth and growth are due.

It cannot be maintained with confidence that wherever Vaughan's notions correspond to those of the Hermetic writers there is a necessary sequence of cause and effect, but once the association has been made in an instance permitting of little doubt it is legitimate to suppose that where other resemblances occur the same factor may possibly be at work. Several such resemblances are to be noted in connexion with the poem 'Resurrection and Immortality' (*Silex Scintillans*, 1650, pp. 400-402). This is in the form of a dialogue between Soul and Body, and the Body, speaking first, tries to argue that the emergence of a butterfly from the 'dead' chrysalis justifies the hope that 'death' is not the end of all. The argument is not unlike that of St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 35 *sqq.*); but the Soul, which is better instructed in Hermetic lore, chides the Body for its limited outlook, affirming that there is no such thing as death, and observing

how of death we make  
A meere mistake.  
For no thing can to Nothing fall, but still  
Incorporates by skill,  
And then returns, and from the wombe of things  
Such treasure brings  
As *Phenix*-like renew'th  
Both life, and youth. . . .

Several passages in the *Hermetica* are relevant to these lines, but the following may suffice:

(a) in Libellus VIII, p. 175:

The word 'death' is a mere name, without any corresponding fact. For death means destruction; and nothing is destroyed.

(b) in Libellus XI (ii), p. 217:

. . . But men call the change 'death', because, when it takes place, the body is decomposed, and the life departs and is no more seen.

(c) in *Libellus XII* (ii), p. 233 :

Dissolution is not death; it is only the separation of things which were combined; and they undergo dissolution, not to perish, but to be made new.

Vaughan continues with a doctrine of general conservation in the material universe which he combines later with another, more in accord with Christian belief, that when the body dissolves the separation from it of the soul is merely temporary:

For a preserving spirit doth still passe  
Untainted through this Masse,  
Which doth resolve, produce, and ripen all  
That to it fall;  
Nor are those births which we  
Thus suffering see  
Destroy'd at all;

in which there are perhaps reminiscences of *Libellus XII* (ii), p. 235 :

Considered as one whole, my son, the Kosmos is exempt from change; but all its parts are subject to change. But there is nothing in it that suffers corruption or destruction; if men think otherwise, their thoughts are confused by the terms in use.

and of *Libellus XVI*, p. 267 :

he puts life into the things in this region of the Kosmos, and stirs them up to birth, and by successive changes remakes the living creatures and transforms them.

In the rest of the poem, which is of a more orthodox Christian tendency, inspection will show that nevertheless some of the imaginative material is paralleled by sentences in the *Hermetica* already cited.

In other poems or passages by Vaughan it seems at least arguable that the Hermetic influence can be perceived although it may not always be direct or unmixed with that of notions more peculiar to later thought.

1. It has already been suggested<sup>1</sup> that the theory of childhood set forth in 'The Retreate' may owe something to *Libellus X*, p. 197 :

Look at the soul of a child, my son, a soul that has not yet come to accept its separation from its source; for its body is still small, and has not yet grown to its full bulk. How beautiful is such a soul as that! It is not yet fouled by the bodily passions; it is still hardly detached from the Kosmos. But when the body has increased in bulk, and has drawn the soul down into its material mass, it generates oblivion. . . .

Compare also *Libellus XII* (ii), p. 235 : 'Birth is not a beginning of life, but only a beginning of consciousness'.

<sup>1</sup> In *Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir Herbert Grierson* (1938), p. 247.

2. In several places Vaughan gives an animistic turn to the words of St. Paul in Romans viii. 19 and 22, about the earnest expectation of the creature, and might have quoted Libellus XII (ii), p. 233, as his sanction:

Now this whole Kosmos . . . is one mass of life. . . . There is not, and never has been, and never will be in the Kosmos anything that is dead.

And when Vaughan wrote in stanza 3 of 'Rules and Lessons', p. 436:

Walk with thy fellow-creatures: note the *hush*  
And *whispers* amongst them. There's not a *Spring*,  
Or *Leafe* but hath his *Morning-hymn*; Each *Bush*  
And *Oak* doth know *I AM*; canst thou not sing?

he may have remembered the following passage in the same Libellus, p. 235:

God foretells the future to him in manifold ways, by the flight of birds, by the inward parts of beasts, by inspiration, or by the whispering of an oak-tree.

3. Whatever earlier or later instances may be adduced, there is Hermetic authority also for Vaughan's admiration of the orderly and obedient behaviour of the stars in their courses, which he contrasts with the frowardness of man. In 'The Constellation,' p. 469, he writes:

Fair, order'd lights (whose motion without noise  
Resembles those true Joys  
Whose spring is on that hil where you do grow  
And we here tast sometimes below,)

With what exact obedience do you move  
Now beneath, and now above,  
And in your vast progressions overlook  
The darkest night, and closest nook!

Some nights I see you in the gladsome East,  
Some others neer the West,  
And when I cannot see, yet do you shine  
And beat about your endles line.

and in *The Mount of Olives*, p. 144:

Contemplate the *Order* of the Stars, and how they all in their several stations praise their Creator.

thus echoing Libellus VIII, p. 177:

But it is only the living creatures upon earth that are involved in this disorder. The bodies of the celestial gods [sc. the heavenly bodies] keep without change that order which has been assigned to them by the Father in the beginning; and that order is preserved unbroken by the reinstatement of each of them in its former place.

# HENRY VAUGHAN AND 'HERMES TRISMEGISTUS' 307

and Libellus V, p. 159:

If you wish to see Him, think on the course of the Moon, think on the order of the stars. Who is it that maintains that order? . . . Each of these stars too is confined by measured limits, and has an appointed space to range in.

4. It is just possible that the well-known opening of 'The World', p. 466:

I saw Eternity the other night  
Like a great *Ring* of pure and endless light,  
All calm, as it was bright,  
And round beneath it, Time in hours, days, years  
Driv'n by the spheres  
Like a vast shadow mov'd, In which the world  
And all her train were hurl'd.

owes something to Hermetic doctrine, although Vaughan is more certainly influenced by a passage in Felltham's *Resolves* ('*Of Time's continuall speede*', 4th ed., 1631, p. 25), where there is a vision of 'Eternities Ring' cast round the attractions of Virtue and Vice.<sup>1</sup> The relevant Hermetic passage is in Asclepius III, p. 353:

Eternity then is not limited by the conditions of time; and time, which admits of numerical limitations, is eternal in virtue of its cyclic recurrence. Thus time as well as eternity is infinite, and is thought to be eternal. But eternity is rightly held to rank above time, in virtue of its fixity; for it is firmly fixed, so as to be able, by its rigid immobility, to sustain those things which are in motion. . . . For the Kosmos, changeless in virtue of the unalterable law by which its motion is determined, revolves with an everlasting movement.

It must be emphasized that in these remarks no account has been taken of any annotations or modifications of the original Hermetic doctrines which may have been made between the third century and the time when Henry Vaughan wrote his poetry. There is room and need for a full listing of the analogies which the intervening period might provide. Nor is any claim made that the similarities pointed out above are exhaustive even of the limited field here entered. But such as they are they may serve to illustrate a relationship which appears not to have been duly appreciated, and they show that several of Vaughan's characteristic ideas have their correspondences and partly originated in the writings attributed to 'thrice-great Hermes'.

<sup>1</sup> This correspondence was pointed out to me a few years ago by one of my students, Mr. Matthew Murphy. Vaughan knew the *Resolves* very well.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### RIDDLE 8 OF THE *EXETER BOOK*

Many guesses have been made at the subject of the Old English poem known as Riddle 8 of the *Exeter Book*. Pipe (the musical instrument), bell, nightingale, wood-pigeon, chough, jackdaw and jay have all, at one time or another, had their supporters, but present-day opinion is overwhelmingly in favour of a song-bird (the poem actually comes second in a group of four on birds), and the favourite is jay. Thus the Columbia University editors of the *Exeter Book* (1936) say that jay 'is the most plausible solution for this riddle',<sup>1</sup> while the E.E.T.S. editor, W. S. Mackie (1934), regards this answer as 'certain or very probable'.<sup>2</sup> It seems, therefore, time to reconsider the claims of this bird to be the subject of the poem.

At the outset it is necessary to clear up a misunderstanding. Some of the solutions hitherto put forward are based wholly or largely on the assumption that the odd-looking symbol  $\eta$  which stands just under an inch to the left of the two words that make up the last line of the preceding Swan Riddle is a rune. It is further assumed that it is a title-rune for Riddle 8 and that it represents the rune *C*. After examining fol. 105a of the manuscript in Chambers's and Flower's facsimile edition of the *Exeter Book* I was inclined to agree with the opinion expressed by Krapp and Dobbie that 'the rune probably belongs to the preceding riddle'; the natural place to look for a title-rune would be the middle of the line. Then I noticed the appearance of the 'rune' as compared not only with the strong and beautiful script of the text, but also with the other runes that crop up in this part of the *Exeter Book*. It was written very faint and thin. On turning to that part of the introduction in the facsimile edition that relates to runes we find on p. 64 this footnote: 'Editors have sometimes mistaken modern casual scribblings for runes. Thorpe p. 390 took for an S-rune what is really a modern imitation of the old *n* in *ne beom* (Riddle 7)'. This modern imitation of the old *n* is the symbol to

<sup>1</sup> *The Exeter Book*, ed. Krapp and Dobbie, New York, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> *The Exeter Book*, ii, Poems ix-xxxii, ed. W. S. Mackie (E.E.T.S. 1934), Appendix A, Solutions.



which so much importance has been attached by commentators on Riddle 8. Any solution, therefore, resting wholly or chiefly on the evidence of this first S- and now C-rune becomes suspect. This applies to Dietrich's 'wood-pigeon' (O.E. 'cuscote'),<sup>1</sup> Mackie's 'chough' (O.E. *cēo*),<sup>2</sup> Holthausen's defence of Trautmann's first suggestion 'bell' (O.E. 'clugge'),<sup>3</sup> and Dietrich's alternative solution 'pipe' (L. 'camena').<sup>4</sup> It also applies to a lesser extent to Tupper's 'jay' (O.E. 'higora'),<sup>5</sup> since the possibility that the Latin name of this bird in the Old English Glosses, 'cicianus' and 'catanus', 'may have suggested the C-rune', is only adduced as supporting evidence.

The chief reason the jay solution is so popular is that in one and a half lines of this eleven-lined poem a bird with powers of mimicry is indicated: 'þe swā scirenige scēawendwisan/ hlūde onhyrge.' It is claimed that a jay possesses these, since in Riddle 25 the 'higora' (jay or woodpecker) is credited with the ability to bark like a dog, bleat like a goat, scream like a goose and hawk, imitate the eagle and raven, recall the voice of the kite and sea-mew.<sup>6</sup> The translation of the line and a half in question depends in part on the meaning given to the obscure words 'scirenige' and 'scēawendwisan'. The first of these has, since Cosijn's article in *Beiträge* been generally accepted as standing for 'scericege', 'mime' (Cosijn emends to 'sciernicge').<sup>7</sup> The second 'scēawendwisan' is taken to be related to 'scēawendspær', glossed 'scurrilitas', and to mean 'jesting song' or 'song(s) of jesters'.<sup>8</sup> So the passage might run: 'who thus loudly imitate the voices of jesters in the manner of a mime'. On the other hand Wyatt would emend to 'scire cige'.<sup>9</sup> This involves less alteration to the manuscript reading, and, although he takes as two words what there is written as one, there are in this poem several instances both of two separate words written as one, and also of single words written as two.<sup>10</sup> If Wyatt's reading be adopted, which only involves the altering of *n* to *c* the result is: 'who thus cry clearly, loudly imitate a jesting song' or 'the song(s) of jesters'. In any case the bird is said to imitate ('onhyrge') so that only a bird with this characteristic can compete for the title to the poem. At this stage it should be noted that one of

<sup>1</sup> *Zeits. deut. Alt.* (1859), XI.

<sup>2</sup> *Mod. Lang. Review* (1933), xxviii, 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Anglia Bb.* (1898), IX, p. 357.

<sup>4</sup> *Zeits. deut. Alt.*, XI, p. 462.

<sup>5</sup> *The Riddles of the Exeter Book* (1910), p. 84.

<sup>6</sup> *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Tupper, pp. 84, 122.

<sup>7</sup> *Beiträge*, Paul u. Braune, xxiii., p. 128.

<sup>8</sup> *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, p. 86.

<sup>9</sup> Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1898), IV, I, p. 837.

<sup>10</sup> 'nemipe', 'inburgum', 'onwicum', 'ichatte', and 'heafod woþe', 'æfen sceop'.

the earliest suggestions made was 'nightingale', and that this interpretation has commended itself to several scholars. Thus Dietrich in his first article on the poem hesitated between pipe and nightingale.<sup>1</sup> Trautmann gave up his bell for the bird when he edited the Riddles,<sup>2</sup> and Tupper, the first to suggest jay, says that he considers the nightingale to be the best of the solutions put forward up to date (1910), but that 'it does not fit the rune'.<sup>3</sup>

Now it is surely rather odd that two birds differing as much from each other as do nightingale and jay should both be looked upon as possible candidates. The nightingale's fame as a songster needs no comment, but according to present-day authorities on bird-song the jay is not a songster at all, 'though it sometimes exhibits a sort of sub-song, or harsh call repeated two or three times'. What inspires the poem is the bird's gift of song. Thus it is said to speak in many tones, to sing with modulations of the voice, to change its chief song ('*heafodwōp*') often, to cry loudly, to continue its melody and not to refrain from utterance: an aged evening bard ('*eald æfensceop*') it brings joy ('*blisse*') to men in their dwellings when it cries with modulated voice: they sit still in their homes with bowed heads:<sup>4</sup> people are to guess its name that thus cries clearly, loudly imitates a jesting song ('*sceawendwisan*') and announces to men many welcome things by means of its voice. An unbiased reader of the poem would, I think, if asked to choose between nightingale and jay, vote for the nightingale not only on the score of voice but habits. The jay in England is notoriously shy and a denizen of the woods: 'it is a wary bird and soon takes cover'<sup>5</sup> and so would be unlikely to sing to men near their dwellings or homes, and it is not a nocturnal singer. The fact that the first two lines of the Old English poem,

Ic þurh mūþ sprece mongum reordum,  
wrencum singe, wrixle geneahhe  
heafodwōpe,

echo those of Aldhelm's Latin enigma on the nightingale, *De Luscinia*,

Vox mea diversis variatur pulchra figuris,  
Raucisonis nunquam modulabor carmina rostris,

might be adduced to strengthen the case in favour of this bird, but that the poems are so different otherwise, Aldhelm's intention being

<sup>1</sup> *Zeits. deut. Alt.*, XI, p. 239.

<sup>2</sup> *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, p. 84, notes.

<sup>3</sup> Adopting Grein's suggestion 'hnigende' for the MS. 'nigende'.

<sup>4</sup> *British Birds*, S. Vere Benson, p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Anglia Bb.*, XXV, p. 327.

to draw a contrast between the insignificance of the bird's appearance and the splendour of its song. There is, too, the difficulty of the mimicry. It is because I feel that the Old English poet had in mind a bird whose powers of song were not far short of those of the nightingale yet which was at the same time a mimic, that I venture to put forward yet another interpretation of the poem—blackbird or song-thrush. Both these birds were known in Anglo-Saxon times though there is evidence that they were confused,<sup>1</sup> and many of the things said about the bird in Riddle 8 could apply with equal truth to either. But I am inclined to think that a thrush is meant for the following reasons. First, this bird is known to be an effective mimic; plover, wader, cuckoo, blackbird, partridge, linnet, and, most interesting of all in view of our problem, nightingale, all being amongst its victims.<sup>2</sup> It is reported to have performed a partridge's turr-whit so well once in Berks that the partridge replied,<sup>3</sup> and of one from Norfolk it is told that it called out 'Mrs. Hewett' so clearly that on one occasion a woman of that name answered 'Yes!'<sup>4</sup> Then the thrush rather than the blackbird may be said to have a 'hēafodwōp' chief melody which it often varies, to judge from my experiences while listening to the singing of both of these birds during the spring of 1941. The epithets 'loudly', 'clearly', may be more fittingly applied to the shriller notes of the thrush than the mellow meandering ones of the blackbird. The thrush, too, may be said to 'continue' its melody and 'not refrain from utterance' in a way that the blackbird cannot; the thrush will sing 'commonly for minutes on end without a single pause of as long as one second though pauses of up to about half a second are very frequent', while the 'great majority' of the song-phrases of the blackbird 'last only from two to four seconds and each phrase is separated from the next by an interval nearly as long as the phrase or longer often more than five seconds'.<sup>5</sup> Both birds live to a good age, the average age of a group of twenty thrushes being fifteen years eleven months according to S. Flower in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society*, 1938, p. 208. It is interesting to note

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *Prolegomena to Life of St. Benedict*, pp. 131, 132, cp. with Werferth's translation: the Greek 'κόσσυφος' and Latin 'merula' are rendered by 'throstle' which is described as in the original as 'sum swiþe sweart ond lytel fugel', Grein, *Bibl. A-S. Prosa*, V, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Songs of Wild Birds*, Nicholson and Koch, London, 1936, p. 140. *Bird Song*, Stanley Morris, 1925, under *thrush*.

<sup>3</sup> *Songs of Wild Birds*, Nicholson and Koch, p. 140.

<sup>4</sup> *Songs of the Birds*, Garstang, 1922.

<sup>5</sup> *Songs of Wild Birds*, Nicholson and Koch, p. 143. *The British Bird Book*, I, Kirkman, London, 1911, p. 365.

that Chaucer calls the thrush 'the throstel olde'.<sup>1</sup> Both again, the nightingale excepted, are the last birds to sing in the evening.

It may be thought that I am ascribing greater powers of observation to the unknown Anglo-Saxon poet than would seem warranted by most references to nature in the Old English poetry that has come down to us; but the authors of some of the Riddles stand out from amongst their fellows on account of their delicate feeling for small creatures. Birds in particular interested the Anglo-Saxon draughtsman<sup>2</sup> and mason<sup>3</sup>, and the 'naturalism' shown by the early Anglo-Saxon attracted by animal ornament has recently puzzled a Swedish archæologist.<sup>4</sup> Finally, to judge from the references to things musical in their poetry, love of music appears to have been one of the chief characteristics of our forefathers. It is therefore difficult to believe that an early English poet would have expatiated on the pleasure he felt in listening to the screaming of a jay. Hearing a thrush sing in the evening he might well write Riddle 8.

JEAN I. YOUNG.

#### MEPHISTOPHILIS AND THE LOST 'DRAGON'<sup>5</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to indicate how a very famous part of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, the first appearance of Mephistophilis, was produced on the Elizabethan stage.

The passage in question begins with Faustus's invocation to the powers of hell. I quote from the 1616 text<sup>6</sup>:

. . . propitiamus vos, vt appareat, & surgat Mephistophilis Dragon, quod tumeraris . . . ipse nunc surgat nobis dicatus Mephistophilis.

##### Enter Deuill

I charge thee to return and change thy shape,  
Thou art too ugly to attend on me:  
Goe and returne an old Franciscan Frier,

<sup>1</sup> *Parlement of Foules*, *Works of Chaucer*, ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1899, Vol. I., p. 348, l. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Illustrations to the Cædmonian Genesis, *Archæologia*, 24, pll. lvii, lx, lxi, lxxxix.

<sup>3</sup> *Catalogue of Stones in Durham Cathedral Library*, Greenwell.

<sup>4</sup> Åberg, *The Anglo-Saxons in England* (Uppsala, 1926), pp. 161-8.

<sup>5</sup> Owing to delays in the transatlantic mails, the author has been unable to read proofs.

<sup>6</sup> Act, scene, and line numbering are according to F. S. Boas's edition, New York, 1932, in *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe*, General Editor: R. H. Case. For the 1616 text, I have used a photostat of the 1631 edition in the Henry E. Huntington Library; and for the 1604 text, I have used a photostat of the 1609 edition in the same library. Thus, utilizing Boas's symbols, I have used B5 for B, and A2 for A; B representing the 1616 text and editions printed from it, A representing the 1604 text and editions printed from it.

That holy shape becomes a Deuill best.  
 I see there's vertue in my heavenly words,  
 Who would not be proficient in this Art?  
 How playnt [sic] is this Mephistophilis?  
 Full of obedience and humility,  
 Such is the force of Magicke and my spels.

*Exit Deuill.*

*Enter Mephistophilis.<sup>1</sup>*

What is the English word, 'Dragon', doing in the midst of the Latin? It does not appear in the 1604 version of the invocation. Boas writes:

In the middle of Faustus's Latin invocation B has the English *Dragon*. This is, I believe, a mangled S. D., and is explained by the following words in *E. [nglish] F. [aust] B. [ook]*, ch. ii: 'Faustus . . . began againe to coniure the Spirite Mephosphiles . . . to appeare in his likeness: where at sodainly over his head hanged houering in the ayre a mighty Dragon.'

Hence in his text, Boas puts the stage direction, '[Enter Dragon above.]', between 'et surgat Mephistophilis' and 'Quid tu moraris?'. Concerning this last phrase, Boas has the following note:

*Quid tu moraris?* If this is the right emendation of the unintelligible *quod tumeraris* [of A and B], it is an invocation to Mephistophilis, *Why do you linger?* . . . But the Qq. reading may be a corruption of some phrase beginning *quod* (or *quid*) *tu me* . . . [sic], evoked by the appearance of the dragon.

I agree with Boas that 'Dragon' is a strayed stage direction. But I think much better use could be made of it. Literally speaking, one might say that Boas's dragon does hang in mid-air! It is spectacle unrelated to what is occurring.

Let us read Marlowe's text carefully. Doctor Faustus utters his charm: 'We propitiate you that Mephistophilis may appear and rise. Why do you linger? Now let Mephistophilis himself, dedicated to our service, rise!' Note the double use of 'surgat'. If Mephistophilis is to rise, he can only come from one place. He must ascend through the trap-door.<sup>2</sup> But in what guise does Mephistophilis appear? In so horrible a form that Faustus tells him to begone and to return in the habit of a monk. The horrible apparition sinks beneath the floor; and, a moment later, Mephistophilis appears through one of the usual stage entrances in the garb of a Franciscan.

<sup>1</sup> Sig. Br<sup>1</sup>-v in the 1631 text; I. ii. 19-36. A and B are substantially the same here. B does not have vv. 34-6. I have changed the black letter to roman, and the roman to italic.

<sup>2</sup> For trap-doors in the Shakespearian theatre, see G. F. Reynolds, *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater, 1605-1625* (General Series of the Modern Language Association of America, IX, New York and London, 1940), 88-92, *passim*.

But what about the strayed stage direction, the unadorned, simple word, 'Dragon'? Surely, there are strong grounds for believing that it is a playhouse notation, a marginal *warning* telling the property man to get the property noted ready for immediate use.<sup>1</sup> Surely, the horrible shape of Mephistophilis which rose through the floor was our 'Dragon'.

And there is good substantiation for this hypothesis. I see no good reason to doubt that the illustration on the title-page of the 1616 quarto (and subsequent editions) reflects the stage performance. Look at it.<sup>2</sup> There is Faustus in the midst of a magic circle, wearing a magician's costume,<sup>3</sup> wand in his right hand, necromancer's book in the other. No scene in the play fits this picture so well as the scene we have been discussing. But there is a still more interesting item in this picture. At Faustus' feet is a horrible dragon! And only half of the monster appears.

Another mystery besides the intruding 'Dragon' of the 1616 text is also solved. In Henslowe's '*Eventary tacken of all the properties for my Lord Admeralles men, the 10 of Marche 1598*' appears '*Item, . . . j dragon in fostes*'.<sup>4</sup> Greg's note is, 'The dragon car in *Faustus* (1604, sc. vii (chorus) . . .)' This is far astray. Faustus, 'sitting in a chariot burning bright, / Drawn by the strength of yoked dragons' necks' is so described by the Chorus. He never appears so on the stage. Boas also wanders out of bounds. He writes of Alleyn at the Rose 'probably mounting during the performance on the back of the 'j dragon in Fostes', mentioned in Henslowe's 1598 inventories.<sup>5</sup> However, Faustus does not mount a dragon in the text of the play we possess; to augment the play because of a property mentioned by Henslowe is inadmissible. Greg did not know of the strayed 'Dragon'; Boas did. Boas should have pointed out what is obvious, that Henslowe's 'j dragon in fostes' and the strayed 'Dragon' are one and the same.

<sup>1</sup> On such warnings, see W. W. Greg, *Elizabethan Dramatic Documents* (Oxford University Press, 1931) I, 217-9. 'It will have been noticed that these warnings refer, with few exceptions, to the provision of properties . . .' (p. 219). In the MS. of *Richard II* or *Thomas of Woodstock*, we find the following warnings which have been added by someone in the theatre: 'Peticious: Mace', written in the left margin (167b), properties needed for the ensuing scene, mentioned about 10 and 110 lines later respectively; 'Paper', right margin (168a), required five lines later; 'Blankes', left margin (170b), needed six lines later (*ibid.*, I, 254).

<sup>2</sup> This illustration is the frontispiece to Boas's edition.

<sup>3</sup> An inventory in Alleyn's hand has 'faustus Jerkin his klok,' *Henslowe Papers*, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1907), p. 54.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>5</sup> Introduction to his edition of *Doctor Faustus*, p. 47.



I suggest, therefore, that future editions of *Doctor Faustus* have the following stage direction after Faustus' invocation:<sup>1</sup>

*Enter Mephistophilis from below in the shape of a dragon.*<sup>2</sup>

LEO KIRSCHBAUM.

## TWO PASSAGES IN *RICHARD III*

### (1) An actor's interpolation in Q2 of *Richard III*

- l. i. 97 *Brak.* With this, my lord, myself have nought to do.  
*Glouc.* Naught to do with Mistress Shore? I tell thee, fellow,  
 He that does naught with her (excepting one)  
 100 Were best he do it secretly alone.<sup>3</sup>  
 103 *Brak.* I beseech your grace to pardon me and withal  
 104 Forbear your conference with the noble duke.<sup>4</sup>

After line 100 the second quarto (1598) and all later editions insert

- 101 *Brak.* What one, my lord?  
 102 *Glouc.* Her husband, knave; wouldst thou betray me? <sup>5</sup>

Variants of later quartos which are in the main reprints from the first, are generally not 'substantive', but either misprints or conjectures. Theoretically a second quarto may preserve a text derived

<sup>1</sup> The Henslowe notation makes it obvious that the dragon was a property and not a costume. From the audience's view-point it was Mephistophilis; from the producer's viewpoint, it represented Mephistophilis. The contrast between the horrid and inhuman (and rigid) dragon and the acceptable and human (and moving and speaking) Franciscan friar is calculated and poetic.

<sup>2</sup> The preceding paper was sent to the *Review of English Studies* before I came across the article noted below. In 'Notes on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*', occasioned by the appearance of Boas's edition, C. F. Tucker Brooke pointed out that the late R. K. Root had anticipated Boas's hypothesis that the B text's 'Dragon' was 'a mangled stage direction' (*Philological Quarterly*, XII [1933], 20). The article Brooke referred to is 'Two Notes on Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*', *Englische Studien*, XLIII (1910-11), 144-9. Root makes a point which I should have made, that the word 'Thunder' (in italics, the rest of the s.d. is in roman) at the beginning of Faustus' invocation, being obviously a stage direction, tends to support the hypothesis that 'Dragon' is one too. Root, however, like Boas, finds the explanation of the latter in the *English Faust Book's* 'ouer his head hanged houering in the ayre a mighty Dragon'. But the real reason for this postscript is to point out that Root anticipated the present writer by thirty years in suggesting that the 'Dragon' of the 1616 text and Henslowe's 'dragon in fostes' are one and the same.

<sup>3</sup> *one* and *alone* rhyme in Shakespeare's time. Rhyme outside scene-ends is frequent only in scenes iv. 4 and v. 3; for a complete list of the rhymes in *Richard III* see F. W. Ness, *The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays* (1941), pp. 118-20.

<sup>4</sup> Minor variants: 98-100 arrangement of lines wrong in Ff 100 he doe Qq: to do Ff 103-4 arr. of lines wrong in Qq, worse in Ff 103 I] Qq: I do Ff.

<sup>5</sup> Q2 keeps the pagination of Q1; thus one page in Q2 had to be given two lines more than in Q1. This was done not on the page (A3 recto) which contains the two inserted lines, because it has the signature on its lower margin, but on A2 verso, so that this page shows in its lower margin the two lines which in Q1 are the first of A3 recto. Thus the irregularity does not prove that the insertion was unforeseen when the printing of Q2 began.

from a copy of a lost corrected form of the first quarto;<sup>1</sup> but theoretically any later quarto may be contaminated with a lost 'substantive' witness. Practically the burden of proof falls on those who treat a reading of a later quarto as 'substantive'.

Such a proof has not yet been attempted for these two lines or for any other reading of a later quarto of *Richard III*. If, however, these lines are interpolated, it would be the only instance of such a corruption in a later quarto of *Richard III*. So we may set aside the question of 'substantiveness' and ask which of the texts is (a) the more Shakespearean, (b) the more easily explained as leading to the corruption.

(a) Richard's impudent pun on Brakenbury's 'nought' and the even more impudent 'excepting one' which clearly points at the king, are sufficient ground for Brakenbury to break off the talk. Thus the text of Q1 is unexceptionable.

The prose lines which Q2 adds are stylistically below the level of the scene, which is otherwise blank verse.<sup>2</sup> And as Brakenbury's question does not fit the discretion of his character, so Richard's answer goes a step farther than what precedes it towards clownery which does not fit his character.

(b) The printer of Q1 had no reason to omit the two lines if he found them in his manuscript. But if an actor wanted to entertain the groundlings by a gag on the words 'excepting one' he could hardly do better than insert these two lines into the text of Q1. Hand B in *Sir Thomas More*, which added the clown's part to Munday's text, is a good parallel.

(2) *Richard III*, 1. i. 32

- 32 Plots have I laid inductious-dangerous  
By drunken prophecies, libels and dreams  
To set my brother Clarence and the King  
35 In deadly hate the one against the other.

The first two quartos (1597, 1598) have the reading *inductious dangerous* (I have added the hyphen). The Third Quarto (1602) and all later editions give *inductions dangerous*, inserting a comma after *laid*. This reading is referred to already in J. Marston's *Parasitaster or Faun* 11. i. (ed. pr., 1606, Sign. C3<sup>v</sup>=*Works*, 1887, ii. 143): 'Plots ha' you laid? inductions dangerous?'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. W. Pollard in *Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (1934), p. 278.

<sup>2</sup> The slight metrical anomaly i. 98 *Naught to do* is necessitated by the quotation. The beginning of i. 103 shows a similar licence provoked by the phrase 'I beseech' (cf. 84); *me and* may be slurred.

The reading *inductious* is not discussed in the commentaries and is passed silently in many critical apparatuses, even in one so reliable as that of A. H. Thompson (*The Arden Shakespeare*, 1908). Yet it is the only 'transmitted' ('substantive') one: *inductions* must be regarded as one of the numerous conjectures introduced by the Third Quarto, many of which are misleading.

Under these circumstances the first question is not, whether *inductions* is better than *inductious*, but whether *inductious* is tolerable. This could be denied *prima facie* as long as no dictionary mentioned the word. But in 1901 the *O.E.D.* recorded it from J. Ford, *Line of Life*, which appeared in 1620: *Flattery to either public persons (=both kinds of publ. pers.) is not more inductious on the one side than envy on the other is vigilant* (ed. pr. 74; ed. 1843, 60)<sup>1</sup>. Besides, *inductious* does not sound harsher than *conceptionious* which is recorded only from *Timon of Athens* iv. iii. 186; and asyndetic combinations of adjectives<sup>2</sup> are frequent in *Richard III*, especially in Richard's first monologue: e.g. 9 *grim-visagd War*, 17 *a wanton-ambling nymph*, 23 *in this weak-piping time of peace* (generally misquoted); cf. i. iii. 142 (Richard speaks)

I am too childish-foolish for this world,  
and Thompson's notes to i. 4. 220 and iv. i. 35. In *Jul. Caes.* i. 3. 123:  
an enterprise

Of honourable-dangerous consequence  
sounds like a reminiscence of

Plots have I laid inductious-dangerous.

The reason for the conjectural alteration is obvious: *inductious* was rare and becoming obsolete, while *induction* was a common technical term in theatrical circles and thus easily associated with *plots*.

There remains the question whether *inductions* is so superior to *inductious* that it must be allowed to stand, though it is only a conjecture. I see no advantage in the conjecture. *Inductions* does not construe with *laid* and thus causes an interruption which overcharges the beginning of the sentence. With the transmitted reading the period becomes more fluent and better balanced. P. MAAS.

<sup>1</sup> A similar formation, O. F. *inducieux*, 'seducing', is quoted from an unpublished French document of 1410 by G. Henschel in his edition of Ducange (1843); F. Godefroy (1885) refers to the same text only.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. B. Groom, *The formation and use of compound epithets in English poetry from 1579*, S.P.E. Tract 49 (1927). *Inductious-dangerous* belongs to Groom's bi-adjectival type (p. 296), which he finds especially frequent in *King John* (p. 302).

## TWO MILTON NOTES

## I

'PRECIOUS BANE': A RECOLLECTION OF BOETHIUS IN *PARADISE LOST*?

In Book I of *Paradise Lost*, when the fallen angels set about building Pandemonium, we read that mining operations were led by Mammon:

by him first  
Men also, and by his suggestion taught  
Ransack'd the Center, and with impious hands  
Rifl'd the bowels of their mother Earth  
For Treasures better hid. Soon had his crew  
Op'nd into the Hill a spacious wound  
And dig'd out ribs of Gold. Let none admire  
That riches grow in Hell; that soyle may best  
Deserve the pretious bane. (684-92)

I wonder whether there was not present among the materials that contributed to the making of this passage the memory, conscious or unconscious, of some lines in the *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*? In Book II, section V, Boethius writes, in verse, in praise of a former, simpler age, before men were consumed by the desire for gold. The last lines are:

Heu primus quis fuit ille<sup>1</sup>  
Auri qui pondera tecti  
Gemmasque latere uolentes  
Pretiosa pericula fodit?

It is inconceivable that Milton had not read the *De Consolatione*, and it seems at least possible that Milton's 'precious bane' comes from the 'Pretiosa pericula' of Boethius.

## II

THE 'GOLDEN CHERSONESS'.

Among the embassies enumerated by Satan in that vision of the grandeur of Rome which he shows to the Son of God we have:

From the Asian Kings and Parthian among these,  
From India and the golden Chersoness,  
And utmost Indian Isle Taprobane,  
Dusk faces with white silken Turbants wreath'd. . . .  
(*Paradise Regained*, iv. 73-6)

<sup>1</sup> I quote from the Loeb volume of Boethius, edited by H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand.

Ariosto had already described part of the English knight Astolfo's voyage from the farthest parts of Asia, thus:

Quasi radendo l'aurea Chersonesso,  
La bella armata il gran Pelago frange:  
E costeggiando i ricchi liti spesso  
Vede come nel mar biancheggia il Gange;  
E Taprobane vede e Cori appresso;  
E vede il mar che fra i duo liti s'ange.  
Dopo gran via furo a Cochino, e quindi  
Usciro fuor dei termini degl'Indi.<sup>1</sup>

(*Orlando Furioso*, xv. st. 17)

The coincidence of 'l'aurea Chersonesso' with the mention of 'Taprobane' makes it appear that behind Milton's lovely, familiar lines lies a memory of Ariosto's stanza.

Milton's lines occur in a vision of the grandeur of Rome and the greatness of her empire; Ariosto's stanza immediately precedes a prophetic vision of the greatness of the empire that will be ruled over by Charles V:

il più saggio Imperatore e giusto  
Che sia stato o sarà mai, dopo Augusto.  
(xv. 24)

who will not only hold the empire

Ch'ebbe Augusto, Traian, Marco e Severo  
(xv. 26)

but infinitely more besides. Memory of this vision while he himself was writing of the Roman empire may have led Milton to the memory of the preceding stanza, already quoted, from which he had in any case borrowed once before:

thence  
To Agra and Lahor of great Mogul  
Down to the golden Chersonese . . .  
(*P.L.* xi. 390-2)

(It may be noted that the spelling *Chersoness* in *P.R.* is nearer to Ariosto's; I refer to the Oxford Milton, edited by Beeching.) Ariosto was certainly in Milton's mind when he wrote Book IV of *Paradise Regained*. A later allusion:

So saying he caught him up, and without wing  
Of Hippogrif bore through the Air sublime . . .  
(541-2)

is (as Masson indicated in the notes to his (1874) edition) a direct reference to the *Ippogrifo*, the winged horse which plays such a large part in the *Orlando Furioso*. D. J. GORDON.

<sup>1</sup> I quote from Nicola Zingarelli's edition of the *O.F.*, Milan, 1934.

THE STRANGE CASE OF *OLOR ISCANUS*

Mr. H. R. Walley's article with the above title in the January<sup>1</sup> issue has gone far to explain how the contents of *Olor Iscanus* (1651) differed from those in the collection for which Vaughan wrote a preface in November 1647. It is probable enough that the *Etesia* and *Fida* poems which eventually saw the light in *Thalia Rediviva* (1678) were in the 1647 collection but were suppressed after their author had experienced a religious conversion about the year 1648. That he did not burn these poems, but kept them by him, is an example of natural tenderness towards one's offspring, that can be paralleled in the case of other authors. Mr. Walley is also surely right in arguing that Thomas Powell's commendatory verses prefixed to *Thalia* do not fit that volume, nor yet the chastened *Olor* of 1651, but that they would have suited well enough a projected volume of 1647 which included the love poems, omitted from the 1651 volume, and the war poems of 'young Tyrtæus', some of which appeared in 1651. Powell may be the sponsor of *Olor Iscanus*, which has on its title-page 'Published by a Friend', and even its compiler, though I do not think it follows necessarily that he had access to all Vaughan's unpublished poems and himself made the selection of 'Select Poems'.

There are, however, still further difficulties, which Mr. Walley or others may help to solve. Is Powell also the writer of 'The Publisher to the Reader'? It looks like the style of Humphrey Moseley's prefaces, and Mr. Walley offers no explanation of the phrase in it: 'I have *Law* on my *Side*'. Is it possible that Moseley had advanced money to Vaughan on the projected volume of 1647, and that the author sought to retreat from the bargain after his conversion? 'Fida; or the Country Beauty', at any rate, would have been an odd successor to the divine poems of *Silex Scintillans* of 1650.

When Vaughan dated his dedication of 1647 to Kildare, Lord Digby, that nobleman can hardly have been of age, as his mother, Sarah Boyle, was born on 29 March 1609. Yet Vaughan writes of 'those reputed obstacles', 'Absence and Time', as having 'lain long in my way', although 'I am now (without adulation) as warm and sensible of those numerous favours, and kind Influences receiv'd sometimes from your Lordship, as I really was at the Instant of fruition'. It is strange that he should have incurred obligations long ago to one still so young.

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.*, vol. xviii (1942), pp. 27-37.



Mr. Walley remarks that 'after the valiant dedication to holy works in the preface' (viz. to *Silex*, dated 1654) 'Vaughan published no further works of a religious nature'. But, apart from the late re-issue of *Olor Iscanus* in 1679, his only publications after the completed *Silex* are *Hermetical Physick* (1655), which is markedly religious in tone, and *Thalia Rediviva* (1678), which includes the section headed 'Pious Thoughts and Ejaculations', mostly an after-gleaning in the vein of *Silex Scintillans*. More difficult to explain is the pagan tone of 'Daphnis' in *Thalia*. Is it perhaps in the main a poem written before his conversion, rehandled and enlarged in 1666 to commemorate his twin brother Thomas?

Mr. Walley twice speaks of *Olor Iscanus* as Vaughan's 'one unauthorized publication'. But there is something unexplained about *Thalia* also. Vaughan's name is absent from the title-page, and the dedication and preface are signed 'J. W.' and 'I. W.' (probably the same person, as the capitals I and J were still interchangeable). Yet Vaughan, in his letter to Aubrey of 15 June 1673, writes of *Thalia Rediviva* as 'a peece now ready for the presse, with the Remaines of my brothers Latine Poems'. There is, then, an even longer delay before publication than in the case of *Olor Iscanus*, and when the book comes it does not appear to come from the author's hand. The preface has a cryptic sentence beginning: 'I am to assure, that the Author has no portion of that aiery happiness to lose by any injury or unkindness which may be done to his Verse.' There can be few authors whose life and activities are more difficult to unravel, and Mr. Walley has cleared up so much that we may hope for his help in advancing further.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

#### POINTS IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF JOHN CLEVELAND AND ALEXANDER BROME

The 1653 edition of Cleveland's *Poems* includes three elegies on Charles I, besides the famous lines of Montrose. Of these Dr. Berdan in his edition of Cleveland rejects the 'Chronosticon Decollationis Caroli Regis' and 'An Elegie on the best of Men, and meekest of Martyrs' on stylistic grounds. The former has been assigned with some confidence to Payne Fisher.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Berdan admits into the canon 'An Elegie upon King Charles the First, murdered publicly by

<sup>1</sup> H. F. Brooks, 'Rump Songs, etc.' Oxford Bib. Soc. Proceedings and Papers, vol. v, pt. 4, 1940, p. 296. The Forster copy of the latter bears a MS. inscription 'By Lluellin'.

His Subjects', noting that it is not included in *Clevelandi Vindiciæ*, 1677, and that it had been previously published in *Monumentum Regale*, 1649. Professor Saintsbury follows Dr. Berdan. *Monumentum Regale*, however, which George Thomason acquired on 14 June, 1649, is a collection of anonymous elegies all of which had previously been published separately. 'An Elegie upon King Charles the First' was originally published as *Jeremias Redivivus: or, An Elegiacall Lamentation on the Death of our English Josias, Charles the First, King of Great Britaine, &c. Publiquely Murdered by His Calvinio-Judaicall Subjects*. The piece is a quarto of six pages, without the name of either printer or publisher. Thomason dated his copy 29 May, 1649.<sup>1</sup> *Monumentum Regale* follows the text of this separate print closely, correcting one or two misprints and expanding one or two contractions. The title is taken from the headtitle, not the title-page. Thomason also noted that the elegy was 'said to be written by Walter Mountacute', whom the compilers of the Thomason Catalogue identify with Walter Montagu. Thomason's attribution must be treated with caution, but it provides additional grounds for doubting Cleveland's authorship.

A similar case of early separate printing is that of Alexander Brome's poem 'Upon the Kings imprisonment', included in *Songs and other Poems*, 1661. This seems first to have appeared anonymously as *A Copie of Verses, said to be Composed by His Majestie, upon His first Imprisonment in the Isle of Wight*. This is a single sheet folio without imprint, dated by Thomason 29 September, 1648.<sup>2</sup>

LAURENCE HANSON

#### THE DATE OF MAC FLECKNOE

Scholars have been able to prove that *Mac Flecknoe* circulated in manuscript before its publication on or about 4 October 1682<sup>3</sup> by pointing out allusions to it in several pieces published before that date.<sup>4</sup> Another such allusion, previously overlooked, appears in Thomas Shadwell's poem, *The Tory-Poets*, which Narcissus Luttrell dated 4 September 1682, and this allusion provides further proof of *Mac Flecknoe*'s earlier composition and circulation.

<sup>1</sup> B.M., E. 556. (33.)

<sup>2</sup> B.M., 669: f. 13. (25.)

<sup>3</sup> Narcissus Luttrell's dating.

<sup>4</sup> See G. Thorn-Drury, 'Some Notes on Dryden', *R.E.S.*, I (April 1925), 187-90; Harold Brooks, 'When did Dryden write *Mac Flecknoe*?' *R.E.S.*, XI (January 1935), 74-8; Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: A Bibliography of Early Editions and Drydeniana* (Oxford, 1939), 28-9.

In *Mac Flecknoe* Dryden made what I believe to be his first printed reference to James Shirley, the Jacobean dramatist:

Heywood and Shirley were but types of thee,  
Thou last great prophet of tautology!<sup>1</sup>

If this is Dryden's first written reference to Shirley, and I can find no other, it becomes significant then that in *The Tory-Poets*, a poem published a full month before *Mac Flecknoe*, these lines appear:

Alas! says *Bays*, what are your Wits to me?  
*Chapman's* a sad dul Rogue at *Comedy*;  
*Shirley's* an Ass to write at such a rate.<sup>2</sup>

Now the mention of Chapman indicates that Shadwell had read Dryden's Dedication to *The Spanish Friar*, published in the previous year (1681), where Dryden had been severe upon *Bussy D'Ambois*.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, the mention of Shirley indicates that he had read *Mac Flecknoe*, and, since his poem was published on 4 September 1682, that he had read *Mac Flecknoe* well over a month before its publication. This provides further proof of the availability of Dryden's satire before 4 October 1682.

R. JACK SMITH.

#### JOHNSON'S LETTERS TO BOSWELL

Though the manuscript of large parts of the *Life* was found at Malahide Castle, the letters printed in it were not found there. The inference was clear. When Boswell sent his manuscript to the printer, he included the originals (not copies) of the letters. When the manuscript came back, he no doubt extracted the letters and classified them by their recipients. This inference was confirmed by the find at Fettercairn. There Professor Abbott found about a hundred of the letters printed in the *Life*, and his find corresponded very closely to those letters the originals of which had been given or lent to Boswell and seemed (as had been noticed) to have been retained by him, since they had not since come into the market.

Some of these Boswell must have intended to return. The letters to Lucy Porter were found in a packet with a letter from J. B. Pearson to Boswell<sup>4</sup> (2 April 1784), who, writing on Lucy's behalf, asked

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 29-30. *Works*, edited by Scott-Saintsbury. (Edinburgh, 1882-1893) X. 441.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, edited by Montague Summers. (London, 1927) V. 281. Mr. Summers in a note points out the allusion to *Mac Flecknoe* (V. 448), but he does not mention its significance in dating Dryden's satire.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, VI. 404.

<sup>4</sup> No. 668 in Professor Abbott's *Catalogue*.

Boswell to return the letters when he had done with them. Two other bundles are endorsed 'To be kept' for the owners.<sup>1</sup>

But Professor Abbott had one grievous disappointment. He did not find Johnson's letters to Boswell. One indeed he did find;<sup>2</sup> but it was not with the other Johnson letters, nor in any of the chests and cupboards and sacks in which the Forbes papers had been crammed, but in a portfolio of autographs of various dates. Its presence at Fettercairn might thus be fortuitous.

Various explanations occur of this yawning chasm. First is the ancient tradition of a fire. Malone, in a footnote in the fifth edition of the *Life*, stated his inability to verify a doubtful reading in one of these letters, 'the original letter being burned in a mass of papers in Scotland'. That seemed good enough. But the fire was damped by the modern discovery that the great mass of Boswell's papers did, in fact, survive. There is moreover a question of idiom; to-day, at least, we should rather write 'having been burned'. When Mr. Rupert Gould wrote to the *Times Literary Supplement* suggesting that Malone in fact wrote 'buried', some people thought the fire extinguished.<sup>3</sup>

There are other possibilities. There was some leakage from the collection of Johnson's letters which found its way to Fettercairn. Thus Boswell's endorsement shows that he had, with other letters from Johnson to Reynolds, those of 9 September 1784 (in the Adam collection) and 2 October 1784 (in Harvard College Library). It is known that James Boswell the younger had some of his father's papers in London;<sup>4</sup> he might retain the Johnson letters, and they might be destroyed after his premature death. It is, again, just possible that these letters were at Auchinleck—perhaps in the Ebony Cabinet, that holy of holies—and that they were deliberately, maliciously, destroyed by some member of the family who abounded in the anti-Johnsonian sense.

We must be content, then, for the present at least, with Boswell's text of the letters and any other external evidence that can be collected. The purpose of this note is to examine the evidence furnished by Boswell's journals. It was his habit to record the receipt of letters from his Mentor, almost always, when he was in Edinburgh and Johnson in London, four days after the letters were written. In the calendar which follows I give for each year (1) the date of Johnson's

<sup>1</sup> Richard Farmer and Joseph Warton. Abbott, *Catalogue*, Nos. 1505, 1586.

<sup>2</sup> That of 11 July, 1784. Abbott, *Catalogue*, p. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> See F. A. Pottle, *Catalogue of the Private Papers*, p. viii.

<sup>4</sup> See Pottle, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

letter, with a reference to the edition of the *Life* by Hill or Hill and Powell (the pages are the same in both); the letters are from London (or possibly Streatham or Southwark) unless a place is named; (2) Boswell's record of receipt, with a reference to the *Private Papers*; if there is no record I indicate a reason: that Boswell kept no journal, that the journal is lost or not accessible, or that Boswell was below form.

It will be understood that the relevant Fettercairn documents, namely the Journals from 15 November 1762 to 4 August 1763 and from 20 March to 23 May 1778, and the 'Register of Letters Sent and Received' from June 1769 to December 1777 (with certain gaps), are not yet available.

My record, though it is mainly a series of figures, has glimpses of entertainment. It will be seen that, when the necessary allowances have been made, Boswell appears as a punctilious accountant of his growing treasure. But the main inference to be drawn, though it is negative, is of some moment. If Professor Pottle's Index to the Papers may be relied on—as surely it may—as complete, Boswell does not record the receipt of a single letter from Johnson which he did not print, at least in part, in the *Life*. We may confidently infer that he neither lost nor suppressed any letter that he had ever received.

The record affords also a positive picture of the rise of Boswell's intimacy with Johnson and of its sad decline. The correspondence reached its zenith with the prospect, fulfilment, and retrospect of the Hebridean tour and its literary products. It declined sharply as Johnson's health failed and Boswell began to go down hill in the early 'eighties. In the last years, when Johnson, often ill and always lonely, turned to letter-writing for occupation and consolation, there is a brief pathetic recovery.

- 1763 8 Dec.=i. 473.—No journal available. *B.P.* ii. 190-3 gives only specimen of B.'s rough notes.  
 1766 14 Jan.=ii. 3.—21 Jan. (Paris). vii. 60.  
 21 Aug.=ii. 20.—No journal.  
 1768 23 (?25) March=ii. 58.—No record; but Chambers said to Boswell at Oxford, 26 March, 'Mr. Johnson wrote to you yesterday', vii. 169.  
 1769 9 Sept. (Brighton)=ii. 70.—11 Sept. (London). viii. 106.  
 9 Nov.=ii. 110.—No journal.  
 1771 20 June=ii. 140.—No journal.

- 1772 15 March=ii. 145.—No record. B. met J. in London 21 March; 'You have not had my letter?'—'No, Sir'. ix. 20.  
31 Aug.=ii. 201.—No journal.
- 1773 24 Feb., 5 July, 3 Aug. (bis), 11 Aug. (Newcastle),=ii. 204, 264-6.—Only very brief notes for a journal survive.  
14 Aug. (Edinburgh)=ii. 266.—No journal, but see *Tour to the Hebrides*.  
27 Nov.=ii. 268.—No journal.
- 1774 29 Jan., 7 Feb., 5 March, c. 15 March, 10 May, (27 May), =ii. 271-7.—No journal written, see ix. 117. B. beginning a new journal 14 June with 'Review of my life for some time previous' makes it clear that he had kept no journal since his parting with Johnson 22 Nov. 1773.  
21 June=ii. 279.—25 June, ix. 128.  
4 July=ii. 279.—9 July, ix. 138.  
1 Oct.=ii. 284.—5 Oct., x. 13.  
27 Oct.=ii. 287.—No record. B. returned from Dumfermline 4 Nov. 'with an avidity for drinking'. x. 49.  
26 Nov.=ii. 288.—No record. B. was very drunk 29 Nov. and had a hangover next day. The journal 1-2 Dec. is almost blank.
- 1775 14 and 21 Jan.=ii. 290, 292.—18 and 25 Jan., x. 85 and 88.  
28 Jan.=ii. 294.—No record. The journal 1-2 Feb. is very brief.  
7 Feb.=ii. 296.—11 Feb., x. 95.  
25 Feb.=ii. 309.—The journal 1-3 March is very brief. The entry for 6 March is, however, full of Ossian.  
27 May=ii. 379.—No journal, x. 226. Boswell notes (x. 227) 'Not a single letter from him this (i.e. summer) Session'.  
27 and 30 Aug.=ii. 381, 384.—For 24 Aug. to 3 Sept. we have only a condensed journal.  
14 Sept.=ii. 384.—No journal.  
16 Nov.=ii. 387.—The journal for 21-22 Nov. is missing, xi. 16.
- 1776 10 Jan., 15 Jan., 3 Feb., 9 Feb., 15 Feb., 24 Feb., 5 March, =ii. 412-23.—16 Jan., 20 Jan., 7 Feb., 12 Feb., 19 Feb., 28 Feb., 9 March, xi. 50, 73, 75, 91, 96, 101, 107, 118.  
12 March=ii. 424.—No record. B. left Edinburgh 11 March. xi. 125.  
c. 2 Apr. (Bath)=iii. 44.—'I received the following answer' (B. in *Life*).



- 16 May (to Mrs. B.)=iii. 85.—No record; B. left London  
 17 May, xi. 291.  
 2 and 6 July=iii. 86, 88.—No record in journal at the time of  
 receipt, when Boswell was sunk in gloom; but the letters are  
 mentioned 23 Aug. xii. 32.  
 16 Nov., 21 Dec.,=iii. 93, 94.—20 Nov., 25 Dec., xii. 83, 105.  
 1777 18 Feb.=iii. 104.—22 Feb., xii. 135.  
 11 March=iii. 105.—18 March (Riccarton), xii. 149.  
 3 May=iii. 108.—B. at Auchinleck. No journal 9–18 May,  
 xii. 193.  
 24 June=iii. 124.—B. very drunk 28 June, recovering 29–30,  
 xii. 204.  
 28 June, 22 July (enclosing no doubt the letter of the same  
 date to Mrs. B.),=iii. 120, 127, 129.—2 July, 26 July, xii. 205,  
 210.  
 4 Aug. (Oxford)=iii. 130.—9 Aug., xii. 215.  
 1 Sept. (Ashbourne)=iii. 131.—7 Sept., xii. 224.  
 11 Sept. (Ashbourne)=iii. 135.—No record. B. reached  
 Ashbourne 14 Sept.  
 23 Sept. (Ashbourne). Not in the *Life*; but it is hardly a letter.  
 —23 Sept., xvi. 67.  
 25 Nov.=iii. 210.—29 Nov., xiii. 78.  
 27 Dec.=iii. 214.—No record; the journal 31 Dec. to 2 Jan.  
 is very brief. B. was in low spirits.  
 1778 24 Jan.=iii. 215.—28 Jan., xiii. 89.  
 25 Apr.=iii. 277.—The journal is extant but not accessible.  
 3 July=iii. 362.—No journal for 7 to 9 July, xiii. 128.  
 21 Nov.=iii. 368.—The journal is very brief, xiii. 187.  
 1779 13 March=iii. 372.—No record; B. reached London 16  
 March, xiii. 210.  
 (26 Apr.)=iii. 391.—The *Life* records the receipt on the same  
 day.  
 13 July=iii. 395.—17 July, xiii. 270.  
 9 Sept. (Streatham)=iii. 396.—13 Sept., xiii. 286.  
 27 Oct.=iii. 413. No journal; B. was at Chester, xiii. 291.  
 13 Nov.=iii. 416. 19 Nov., xiv. 272.  
 1780 8 Apr.=iii. 420.—12 Apr., xiv. 62–3.  
 21 Aug.=iii. 435.—4 Sept., forwarded to Auchinleck, xiv. 110.  
 17 Oct.=iii. 441.—No record. B. did not write his journal for  
 21 Oct. until 30 Oct., and then very briefly.

328 R. E. S., VOL. 18, 1942 (Nº 71, JULY)

- 1781 14 March=iv. 71.—No record. B. left Edinburgh 13 March, xiv. 169.
- 1782 5 Jan.=iv. 136.—9 Jan., xv. 54.  
 28 March=iv. 148.—1 Apr., xv. 72.  
 3 June=iv. 151.—8 June (Valleyfield), xv. 84.  
 4 Aug.=iv. 153.—No record. There is no journal for 28 Aug., and that of 29 Aug. is concerned with Lord Auchinleck's death, xv. 120.  
 7 Sept.=iv. 154.—No journal, xv. 124.  
 c. 22 Sept.=iv. 155.—27 Sept. (Auchinleck), xv. 125.  
 7 Dec.=iv. 157.—11 Dec., xv. 138.  
 7 Dec. (to Mrs. B.) is misdated Sept. in *Life*, iv. 156. See *B.P.*, xv. 244.
- 1783 c. 4 Feb.=iv. 163.—8 Feb., xv. 154.  
 3 July=iv. 231.—No journal, xv. 239.  
 30 Sept.=iv. 241.—10 Oct. (Auchinleck), xvi. 7.  
 24 Dec.=iv. 248.—31 Dec. (delayed by severe frost), xvi. 18.
- 1784 11 Feb.=iv. 259.—On 18 Feb. B. wrote up his journal for a week, and does not record receipt. He refers to the letter, however, under 7 March.  
 27 Feb.=iv. 262.—No record, though B. was busy consulting physicians on Johnson's health.  
 2 March=iv. 262.—The journal for 6–21 March was not written until 31 March.  
 18 March=iv. 264.—The journal stops 21 March; B. left for London next day.  
 30 March, 11 July (misdated June in the *Life*), 26 July, 28 July,=iv. 265, 351, 348, 378, 379.—No journal, xvi. 52.  
 5 Nov. (Lichfield)=iv. 380.—11 Nov., xvi. 57.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

## REVIEWS

**The Parker Chronicle and Laws** (*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 173*). A Facsimile edited by ROBIN FLOWER and HUGH SMITH. [Early English Text Society, O.S., No. 208.] 1941 (for 1937); London: H. Milford. Pp. viii + 56 folios of facsimiles. £3 3s.

This facsimile is a welcome successor to the Exeter Book, and although it is to be regretted that present conditions have delayed the appearance of the introduction, students of Anglo-Saxon will be grateful for the opportunity of studying the manuscript in detail as it is now available by the publication of the collotypes, and will look forward with keen anticipation to the promised discussion of its palæographical and bibliographical problems. It is impossible to turn over the pages of the manuscript (very clearly reproduced by the skill of the photographers and printers) without a quickening of interest in such problems and a growing eagerness to benefit, when the time comes, from the knowledge and experience of the editors. It is gratifying to know that modern scientific methods of photography have been applied to such parts as are blurred and illegible (their value has been proved by the series of plates accompanying Dr. A. H. Smith's article in *London Mediæval Studies*, vol. 1, Part 2, 1938, pp. 179-207), and that the readings established by these methods will be included in the introduction. Fortunately the passages which require such treatment are not very numerous, and it is possible to read the greater part of the manuscript with the naked eye. The succession of hands in the *Chronicle* from 892 onwards can in general be clearly distinguished, as well as the later additions and interpolations. It seems possible, for instance, judging by the eye alone, that the sentence erroneously added to the end of annal 845 and afterwards erased was due to an interpolator (probably at Canterbury?) and not to the original scribe who has marked the end of his entry by his usual sign. (For a different view see A. H. Smith, *The Parker Chronicle*, pp. 6, 19.) The laws, which occupy two gatherings (valuable information on the gatherings and collation of the manuscripts are given in the captions to the plates), are in the same clear

handwriting throughout—on the date of which an authoritative opinion will be welcomed—and can be read without difficulty, while the lists of Popes, Archbishops, and Bishops which occupy the final gathering are also distinct and legible. These lists are of great interest and would obviously repay careful study.

Altogether both the editors and the Early English Text Society are to be congratulated on a most welcome addition to the already available facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

A. J. ROBERTSON.

**Essays on King Horn.** By WALTER H. FRENCH. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. (Cornell Studies in English, Volume XXX.) 1940. Pp. x+204. \$2.50.

This book presents the results of Professor French's investigations into certain problems connected with *King Horn*. Finding himself 'dissatisfied with our information' about the poem, he set about re-examining the text and the metre of the English poem, and, in addition, the names in the various versions of the Horn story. The conclusions he arrived at differ, in some fundamental points, from current opinions. He believes that the poem belongs to the type of the *lai* and that its style is derived from French ('In every particular, the author seems to have been trained in the style of the conquerors', p. 112). The metre, he thinks, is neither 'transitional', as Schipper thought (cf. too, Hall's edition, pp. xlv-xlvi, 'a natural development of the Old English alliterative metre greatly accelerated in its later stages by the strong influence of French prosody'), nor two-stressed, as West thought (cf. *The Versification of King Horn*, 1907); it is iambic trimeter 'with a few standard variations' (p. 149). Though, as has been generally recognized, the three extant manuscripts are all very corrupt, Professor French believes that, by comparing them, the readings of the original can often be restored. The comparison which he undertook for this purpose convinced him that, contrary to the usual view, the Cambridge manuscript (C) is not the best; the readings of MS. Harleian 2253 (L) are, in many respects, much better, and when they are supported by those of the Laud manuscript (O) they are 'almost invariably right' (p. 44).

Professor French's main conclusions about the origin of the story of Horn and the relations of the chief extant versions are nearer the views of some other scholars. He claims that the names show it to have been 'a Germanic story, probably Norse', arising in the Norse

districts of England, and they show, too, that the English *King Horn* represents an earlier form of the story than *Horn et Rimenhild*. His theory about the earliest literary form in which the story appeared is more unusual. It was, he thinks, 'a Norman-French *lai*, produced on the Border and much the same in style and substance as KH [*King Horn*]; *King Horn* itself was 'translated . . . closely' from this (pp. 143-4).

Of these conclusions, those that relate to the text and the metre are intimately connected with one another, and this connection is reflected in the author's arrangement of his material. He begins Section II ('The Meter and the Text') by discussing earlier theories about the metre and proposing his own view of it (pp. 23-35), but he defers the completion of his argument that it is the trimeter until after he has made a detailed examination of the text (i.e. until pp. 102 ff.). This arrangement, though awkward, is justifiable, for his view of the metre depends for its proof on the readings of the original text which he claims to be able to restore. The link between his theories about the metre and his theories about the text is thus clearly a fundamental one; but there are some connections which he endeavours to establish which have less basis in fact. For instance, the two theories that the poem is written in trimeter and that it is a *lai* are, in reality, quite independent and (as will be shown later) there are no grounds for the suggestion made on p. 23 that the first provides a reason for believing in the second.

It is to the author's advantage that his conclusions should, as far as possible, be considered separately, for they are by no means all equally well supported by evidence. There is, for example, little that could be called 'proof' in the section which claims to show that *King Horn* is a *lai*. The chief characteristics of the *lai* are said to be that the narrative was a 'courtly product' (p. 6) and that there was some connection between the *lai* and music. Professor French states that *King Horn* 'is clearly a poem of the court' (p. 7); but, of the features which he adduces in support of this statement, the second (that the chief figures are aristocratic) is true of most of the chief characters in *Havelok*, a poem which no one regards as courtly, while the others (that the scene is usually at court and that the hero has the virtues of a courtier) are not sufficiently uncommon in romance to have much significance. The connection with music is said to be reflected in the technique of the *lai*, the chief result of it being that the narrative as a whole is subordinated to the music (p. 14) and is, therefore, 'rapid

and condensed rather than expansive and deliberate'. These statements, however, admittedly apply to a 'primitive lai-type' which is 'something of an abstraction' (p. 15). The best known of the surviving *lais*, for example, those of Marie de France, have modified this primitive (and hypothetical) form and in them the story has become 'an end in itself . . . given without accompanying notes'. According to Professor French, 'the original of the English *King Horn* appeared when the equilibrium had not been so effectively altered; when song had not been forgotten as a part of the work' (p. 17). In support of this, he quotes the line 'A sang ihc schal 3ou singe' (though in *Cursor Mundi*, l. 23, the word 'sanges' seems to have much the same meaning as 'storis' in l. 21); and he notes 'the suitability of certain passages for singing' (e.g. Horn's farewell to his ship). This is hardly sufficient to prove that *King Horn* is 'a poem of the transition from the lyric to the narrative lai', but it is all that could be regarded as evidence. As has been noted earlier, Professor French suggests that the metre of *King Horn* (that is, according to his view, the trimeter) provides another reason for believing the poem to be a *lai* (cf. p. 23); but, as he himself indicates (cf. p. 112), the trimeter is not the metre of any *lai*, with the single exception of the *Lai du Cor*. The implication (it is never explicitly stated) that the *Lai du Cor* represents, from the metrical point of view, an early form of the *lai* is a mere assumption, yet it is followed by the remark that 'With the *Lai du Cor* to point to, we are close to a demonstration of the way in which *King Horn* acquired its form'; and, without further evidence, there follow in the next paragraph the two statements that 'Everything therefore favors the theory that the style of *King Horn* was derived from the French' and that its treatment is 'just like that in the French *lais*' (p. 112).

This discussion has been given at some length as an illustration of the author's method of argument. The same apparent inability to recognize what constitutes evidence appears elsewhere in the book, even in those parts of it in which he seems to have a better case, such as the section on the metre and the text. In the Textual Notes we find, side by side, acceptable suggestions for restoring the readings of the original (that is, emendations based either on the readings of the manuscripts or on general practices in the texts, as, for example, those in ll. 7, 44, 47, 111, 307-8, 831, 841, 998, and many others) and suggestions many of which are admittedly pure guess-work (see the long lists of proposed emendations which are termed 'risky' or



at best 'probable', pp. 96-8). A large number of these emendations are proposed for the sole purpose of making a line a correct trimeter (cf. for example, l. 212, where the rejected reading is in all manuscripts and is, too, good sense), though the author's aim in examining the text is to show that, when the original readings are restored, the metre is the trimeter. It is true that Professor French frankly recognizes what he is doing. He writes, 'Without insisting that the poem is in iambic trimeter, I should still like to use this as a working hypothesis. This may seem to be reasoning in a circle—the hypothesis is derived from the text; yet if the text contradicts the hypothesis, it must be revised to accord with it' (p. 43). He believes, however, that he can 'escape this danger' (presumably the danger of arguing in a circle) by taking care that only the emendations based on some evidence are 'assigned any value until the weight of evidence becomes overwhelming'. What he fails to recognize is that his unsupported emendations remain purely conjectural whatever conclusions he arrives at and they can never be of any value as evidence. The point that the metre is the trimeter can only be proved by showing that lines restored on the basis of good evidence are always in trimeter; and the whole argument would have been clearer if the unsupported emendations had been omitted or removed to a later section.

This obscuring of the argument with irrelevant matter is the more regrettable because there seems to be some real support for several of Professor French's main contentions. MS. C does appear to be less reliable than has been thought and a number of its readings seem clearly inferior to those of L. Taking the readings of all three manuscripts into account, it does seem possible to restore with some confidence the original form of many lines. The restored text does suggest that the metre of the original was much more regular than that of any extant text and that it may have been trimeter. If the author had presented clearly the real evidence for these points, he might have carried his readers with him. It is his desire to prove more than this that leads him astray. For instance, he wishes to show, not merely that the original *King Horn* was in trimeter, but that it was written in very regular trimeter. Hence he attempts to emend every line which is, from his point of view, metrically unsatisfactory; and even though he has to admit that, after all his emending, there are about twenty-five tetrameters which he cannot eliminate, these are not allowed to upset his theory; they are merely dismissed with the remark, 'My inclination is to attribute them almost entirely to

the scribes' (cf. pp. 102-3). Again, he goes too far in his indictment of MS. C (pp. 36-8). Though much of it appears justified, there still remain some points in which this manuscript is superior to either of the others. One of them is indicated by Professor French himself when he is considering the forms of the proper names in the three manuscripts. (Cf. p. 120, where 'Reynild' in C is claimed as correct as against 'Ermenild' and 'Hermenyl' in L and O. Cf. also p. 144.) Yet, important as the name-forms are, they are not mentioned among the points that can be reckoned 'in favor of C' in the main discussion of that manuscript, and the reader is thus given an exaggerated view of the relative worthlessness of this text.

The method of argument is, unfortunately, not the only defect of the book. Anyone who works with it will soon discover that there are a great many inaccuracies in it. A number of the references given are incorrect or, at least, inexact. The following are some examples:—

- P. 17. The quotation 'A song i schal zou singe' is not the reading of any manuscript.
- P. 38, last line. Hall's diagram is on p. xi, not p. lv.
- P. 39, n. 10. We are referred to 'Hall's note to l. 1320', which does not exist. His note is on ll. 1315-6.
- P. 40, n. 14. C 1289 seems to be a mistake for L 1298 or C 1290.
- P. 44, n. 35. The reference to l. 944 may be intended for l. 945.
- P. 54. The note on l. 222 attributes to O a reading which is not there.
- P. 56. The note on l. 260 recommends the reading of C, but the reconstructed text (l. 266, p. 162) has a different reading, not found in any manuscript.
- P. 66, notes on ll. 627 and 644. In neither case are the readings of the manuscripts precisely as indicated. These are not isolated instances of an inexact use of phrases such as 'as in others'. Cf., for further examples, the notes on ll. 130, 180.
- P. 73. For 863, read 864.
- P. 74. The note on ll. 879-80 says that the 'lines in the others are trimeters, and therefore preferable'. It is impossible to tell what lines are meant, since L and O have nothing to correspond to C 879-80.
- P. 99, n. 43. For 429, read 430. The second reference, to l. 405, is inexplicable except as a confused reminiscence of the Textual Note on l. 405 (p. 60).

It will be clear from what has been said that this book is provocative and suggestive, rather than conclusive. It makes no final contribution to the problems with which it deals, but it does call in question a number of views which have been fairly generally accepted and it may, therefore, act as a stimulus to further investigation.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

**The English Poems of Charles of Orleans.** Edited by ROBERT STEELE from the MS. British Museum Harleian 682. (Early English Text Society, O.S., Vol. 215.) London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. Pp. xlv+256. 31s. 6d. net.

This edition of the English poems of Charles d'Orleans fills a gap which students of fifteenth-century poetry have long regretted. Hitherto, there was nothing available but the Roxburgh Club edition of 1827 (issued in 44 copies, with an inaccurate text) and an occasional poem or two in an anthology. In 1927 Miss E. P. Hammond published twelve texts from Harley 682 in her *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, and her notes and apparatus to these are of great interest and importance. Now Dr. Robert Steele has given us a transcript of Harley 682, which so far as it can be checked in the present circumstances, is remarkably accurate. He has further increased the interest of his edition by printing the text exactly as it left the hands of the copyist. Corrections of this followed, and these are important; for, as Dr. Steele tells us, 'this revision is distinctly an author's revision, done under his immediate supervision'. A further revision added a line accidentally omitted, and replaced other lines which failed to satisfy the final scrutiny. All this revisionary material is given in footnotes, so that students of fifteenth-century MSS. will be able to follow the various operations. They will also note with interest that the scribe was paid at the rate of 10d. for every 700 lines of verse.

The vital questions facing an editor of these poems are two: first, are they by Charles, and, secondly, were they originally composed in English and later translated into French as they appear in a number of MSS., or *vice versa*? Hitherto the weight of opinion has favoured the view that the Harley 682 poems were the work of an Englishman. This Dr. Steele denies, and seeks to show that Charles was their author. He draws attention to the close connection between what is known as 'Charles's personal MS' of his French poems (MS fr. 25,458. Bib. Nat.) and Harley 682. 'The two MSS are of the same size, the arrangement of the verse on the page is the same, they are substantially identical in matter, and, what is still more significant, in order—an order not found in any other MS'. The hypothesis of Dr. MacCracken that the real author was Charles's sometime custodian, William de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, is subjected to heavy criticism, and MacCracken's evidence does not seem strong enough to sustain his conjecture. Charles's authorship, on the other hand, is

supported by the nature of the variations between the French and English versions, by some portions of the subject-matter, and to some extent by vocabulary. Dr. Steele has certainly made out a strong case, but unfortunately the Society has been unable to publish the notes and apparatus to this text, and it is not possible to check the detailed evidence upon which his statements are based.

This lack is even more noticeable when dealing with the second question. Here the editor tells us that 'the impression left after long study is that in the English form we usually have the original . . . conveying primarily a sentiment of real feeling, while the French form is a work of art, re-written, and polished, completely purged of all personal indications and coarseness'. Unless one had spent something of the time that Dr. Steele has put into the study of this problem it would be impertinent to cavil at this view, or to dismiss it lightly. But at the same time, both on general and on particular grounds, the problem is an exceedingly delicate one. It requires first of all such a knowledge of both the English and French language of the fifteenth century as will enable the student to tell if either language is being mishandled, even to the slightest degree: secondly a close knowledge of the comparative achievements of French and English poetry in the early fifteenth century and a careful estimation of what could be expected of a writer in using these forms of roundel and ballade with the long tradition of French poetry behind him, or one merely nourished on such English experiments in these forms as were available to him. Given such an equipment the delicate task of assigning priority to the French or English versions of these poems might be undertaken. Dr. Steele himself admits the difficulties, and points to one of them when he says: 'there are a number of cases in which it would appear at first sight that the French text has been so misunderstood by the author of the English poem corresponding to it as to raise the question of a rather incompetent translator'. Unfortunately, Dr. Steele gives no examples, but evidently has in mind such lines as:

The leef to serue this heyre hath made me he (l. 2278)  
where the French version reads:

Que ie serue la fueille cest an cy

The word *heyre* is glossed as meaning *year*; but, as Miss Hammond says, 'Is it likely that the author of this translation would himself have written *heyre*?' Probably points such as this will be gone into when the notes on the text are published.

These will be welcome, also, for other reasons, since there is much in these poems that requires some aid for the non-specialist. The elaborate stanza forms of the ballade and roundel, with their limited series of rhymes, variety of rhyme scheme and of envoi, impose many burdens on the poet, and force upon him constructions and words invented for the sake of the rhyme, etc.—all of which require skill and patience to understand. The vocabulary, to take one point, is interesting for its new forms and its mixture of courtly and popular language. Dr. Steele notes that 'the poet uses his shirt six times to illustrate his feelings', to which we may add a seventh in the line

Daunger Wacchith al nyght in his shert (3637).

This, and homely phrases, such as 'sett ther a nayle', or 'Be nice as purs is of an ay', give life and vigour to these verses, written as they are, for the most part, in the allegorical fashion, and under the influence of the code of *amour courtois*. In the face of these burdens the English poet acquits himself well: he frequently manages his verse with considerable ease. True he uses inversion freely, and has a considerable stock of 'linefillers' such as 'welaway', 'parde' and 'lo', of which he is particularly fond; but, at the same time, he has a rhythmical sense almost totally denied to Lydgate and others of his contemporaries.

H. S. BENNETT.

#### Authorship and Sources of 'Gentleness and Nobility'.

A STUDY IN EARLY TUDOR DRAMA. Together with a Text of the Play based on the Black-Letter Original. By KENNETH WALKER CAMERON. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Thistle Press. 1941. Pp. 132. \$2.75.

This publication, which forms part of a thesis presented for a Ph.D. degree at Yale University, has two main purposes. It reproduces, with some minor modifications, the text of *Gentleness and Nobility* from the copy in the British Museum. And it seeks to disprove the attribution of this Dialogue to John Rastell, which since the publication of Dr. A. W. Reed's *Early Tudor Drama* has been generally accepted, and to revive the claim of John Heywood to be its author.

Dr. Cameron begins by a discussion of the background of this debate between a knight, a merchant, and a ploughman. He quotes from a considerable body of contemporary literature with the aim of proving that the piece contains 'little to distinguish it from the

vulgate doctrine of the Renaissance' concerning true gentility, and that therefore it gives few clues to its actual sources. Nevertheless, while discounting any influence on *Gentleness and Nobility* by Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucres*, he cites as an 'indisputable source' Henry Parker's *Dives and Pauper* (printed 1493), giving a long series of extracts from it with parallel lines in the Dialogue. The resemblances do not seem to me to be sufficiently close to justify Dr. Cameron in thus running counter to his own general argument.

In his chapter on 'the authorship and date' of the piece Dr. Cameron follows similar lines but grapples more closely with Dr. Reed's evidences from parallels in *Gentleness and Nobility* and Rastell's other works on, *inter alia*, the importance of reason in argument, opposition to scriptural appeals, and self-sufficiency as a test of nobleness. With regard to the last of these topics he is driven to the unconvincing conclusion that in *The Boke of Purgatory* Rastell copied almost exactly four lines in *Gentleness and Nobility*, which Dr. Cameron dates before 1523, or that both passages had a common source. The strongest point that he makes is in emphasizing the fact that the epilogue spoken by the Philosopher contains several of the chief parallels with Rastell's other writings upon which Dr. Reed relies, and that this epilogue is divided from the body of the piece by a separate 'Amen', and is written not in couplets like the preceding dialogue but in rhyme-royal stanzas. Hence Dr. Cameron contends that Heywood wrote the interlude, in which he brings forward similarities with other of his works, and that Rastell edited it for the press and added the epilogue.

It is part of Dr. Cameron's case to maintain that *Gentleness and Nobility* was acted at the Court of Henry VIII and that its aim was to amuse rather than to edify. He seeks to show that to the aristocratic audience the Ploughman, for whom gentleness does not lie in the knight's high lineage or in the merchant's wealth but in virtuous living, would appear in a partly humorous light. His well-documented thesis would, in my opinion, have carried more weight had it been less patently controversial, and had the author been less anxious to force every point. It deserves attention, but it leaves me still a believer in Rastell's authorship. In any case, Dr. Cameron has done a service in providing a reprint of *Gentleness and Nobility* with modern punctuation and line numbers, and a few emendations.

F. S. BOAS.



**Studies in Early Tudor Criticism Linguistic and Literary.**

By ELIZABETH J. SWEETING. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1940. Pp. xvi + 178. 12s. 6d.

Miss Sweeting has done useful work, and done it carefully and genuinely, in collecting and relating those opinions and principles which determined the way early Tudor English was written, and which determined the status accorded it. The period commends itself by virtue of the masculine wits of its authors (those treated of here are translators, dons, critics, dramatists, poets), wits that delight us over and over again by their ability to fly free from the fascinating toils of pedantry. If Miss Sweeting has liked doing her work, which she clearly has, it is probably because of the way a single position continues to be interpreted by individuals too lively to be found occupying just that single position. But though leaps are made, we are always conscious what the leaps are made *from*. The writers are standing mainly on what for us is barren ground, a battleground rather than a fertile field or a 'jolly' garden. They are busy establishing the right of self-conscious Englishmen to write English, to write the English they are never tired of calling rude, rusty (the reverse of 'polished'?), barbarous, but which they enjoy writing and enjoy writing effectively. The battle they are engaged on had not yet developed into a sham fight: by the time that the ghosts of the same problems are being tilted at in the eighteenth century, it had become wholly clear that English could not be unseated. But if for Caxton and More there was no pedantry, there was restriction. The writers of this period have to put themselves in the right before they can write. And vigorously as almost all of them do it, it is a waste that it has to be done so often, and done with results which, being mainly victorious, are mainly predictable. When a writer no greater than Wilson can write

excepte menne finde delight, thei will not long abide: delight theim, and wyne theim; werie theim, and you lose theim for euer

(quoted on p. 123), when a writer so much smaller than the great writers can write like that, why, we ask, should he trouble to argue the case for English; could any language declare a meaning (which as experienced by Wilson is a subtle meaning) more satisfactorily?

Circumstances have prevented my checking of Miss Sweeting's transcripts of her originals. I have noted misprints, or rather omissions, on pp. 3 (for 'lyt' read 'lyt') and 7 (for 'Salust' read 'Salust'). For 'the perennial translator's problem' (p. 13), Miss

Sweeting meant presumably 'the translator's perennial problem', and she speaks tautologically of English 'clear, lucid and workman-like' (p. 53); 'pauenture' (p. 52) looks like either a misprint of the original compositor or Miss Sweeting's failure to reproduce a 'p' (and compare, in the preceding line, 'sup[er]fluous'). More serious than these cavillings (for Miss Sweeting is no sloven!) is the omission of More's name from the first paragraph of the *Conclusion*, a paragraph which rounds up 'the vitality of Skelton, the sturdiness of the Interlude, the zeal, half-scholarly, half[-]partisan, of the Bible translators, the shrewd good sense of Caxton': the omission of More is like Matthew Arnold's omission of Swift when he considers Augustan prose. More serious again, is the literal interpretation of Skelton (pp. 16ff.): Skelton's 'vitality' was more waggishly employed than Miss Sweeting perhaps credits.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

**Christian Mysticism in the Elizabethan Age with its Background in Mystical Methodology.** By JOSEPH B. COLLINS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1940. London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. Pp. xiv+251. 20s. net.

Dr. Collins credits the Elizabethan age with a spiritual quality which has seldom been justly recognized. He approaches his subject with a study, extending to seventy pages, of the nature of mysticism and its characteristic method, as exhibited in the writings of Plato and the Neo-Platonists, the Christian Fathers and the medieval mystics. The early English printers produced translations of many mystical works. After some decline in the demand for such works in the middle of the century, they were again largely represented in the publications of the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign. Dr. Collins's second Part deals with the translations of foreign mystical writings in Elizabeth's reign. Probably he exaggerates the influence of Elizabeth's translation, at the age of eleven, 'out of French rhyme into English prose', of *Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* by Queen Margaret of Navarre. He rightly stresses the popularity in Elizabethan England of the Spanish mystics—Vives, Diego de Estella and Luis de Granada. It is noteworthy that the translators were as often Protestant as Roman Catholic. The Appendix of 'Mystical Works in English, printed at London, 1500-1600' fails to indicate that many of the books named were printed abroad; this is unfortunate, as such

books were likely to circulate among recusants only and would therefore have less general influence.

At last, in Part III, the English original writings are reached: the sonneteers—Barnabe Barnes, Constable, Henry Lok; the two John Davies, Gervase Markham, Father Parsons, the Earl of Arundel, and, more fully treated, Thomas Lodge; then we reach higher ground, from a spiritual as well as a literary view, with Nicholas Breton and Southwell. The climax of the book is Spenser's *Four Hymnes* (1596). In Dr. Collins's exposition of these authors, with their differing degrees of relation to the recognized mystical type, there is, as in other writers about mystical literature, so strong a determination to find the three 'Ways' that the note appears sometimes to be forced. Almost any devout work can hardly escape from exhibiting to those who mean to find them the successive stages of Purification, Illumination and Union, though the last only is decisive. It is a little surprising that Dr. Collins does not pay more attention to Spenser's own words in dedicating his *Hymnes* to the two Countesses (wrongly styled Duchesses on p. 203). Dr. Collins says that the four hymns 'present Spenser's mature genius', but the poet speaks of the earlier pair as belonging to 'the greener times of my youth'. It is something of a *tour de force* to find mysticism in these addresses to Cytherea, 'great beauties Queene', and the 'mightie God of loue' who sits 'in *Venus* lap aboue'. Dr. Collins will not have it that there is any 'new beginning or fresh start' with the second pair, but finds unity in all four—'the progressive development of human love to divine with the idealized conception of the one, and the mystical treatment of the other'. He can quote other critics in support of his view, but he needs to argue it in closer relation to Spenser's Dedication.

The fundamental conception in Christian mysticism is declared to be that 'human and divine love differ not in kind but in degree'; 'Petrarch and Dante so conceived of love' (p. 208). But earlier (p. 105) it is stated that Petrarch's conception 'regards all love as of divine origin—the human and the divine differing only in kind, not in degree'. Dr. Collins has a fine theme and he develops it with considerable learning, but it could be wished that his English was less cumbersome: e.g. 'The *Consolation* is one with much mystical literature in that it is a *vision* piece', 'the Platonic love and beauty poetry', 'purportedly inspired lines', 'The work itself was innocent of cause of unbiased censure'.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

**Raleigh and Marlowe. A Study of Elizabethan Fustian.**  
By ELEANOR G. CLARK. Fordham University Press. 1941. Pp. x+488. \$4.00.

The author chooses the word 'fustian' as the most suitable of contemporary terms for what she describes as, 'the trick of saying one thing and meaning another, of using historical or mythological episodes as a cloak to cover some personal or political allusion' (p. 13). The first part of the book (pp. 3-219) brings together a body of references which constitute either proof or, at least, strong presumptive evidence that the habit thus described was widespread in Elizabethan dramatic and non-dramatic literature. The second part (pp. 223-472) examines in detail the work of Marlowe in relation to Raleigh and his circle and sets forth the author's claim that there is a substantial body of 'fustian' in Marlowe's plays and that it bears directly on the scientific thought and empire-building ideals of that group.

The cumulative effect of Part I is strong. The considerable body of evidence for the presence of veiled topical allusion that has been accumulated in articles, monographs, editorial prefaces and footnotes is here summed up and substantiated by additional material. Miss Clark makes it clear that this habit was widespread and that both writers and readers were conscious of its prevalence. It was, in fact, the natural outcome of a state censorship striving to impose itself on the Englishman's ineradicable determination to criticize authority, and the course of this conflict is studied in some detail in the first four chapters. A series of chapters follows on certain topics which were made the special subject of veiled satire or allusion (resulting in anti-Spanish plays, 'Essex' plays, 'Somerset' plays and so forth), and here we cannot but respect the author's organization and control of detail. The more confused the issue—as in the history of the position, function and outlook of the censor from decade to decade—the more noticeable is her ability to balance and qualify her conclusion without robbing of definition the main line of her argument.

The evidence for the presence of 'fustian' in the plays of Christopher Marlowe appears to me less convincing than that adduced in the first part. That it was present in many Elizabethan plays is incontestable (but it is worth noting that the majority of those for which it can be incontestably established are of relatively low artistic quality and never the best work of a fine artist). That 'fustian',

in terms of the author's own definition (quoted above), is present, as she states, in *Faustus* and *Tamburlaine* or even in *The Jew of Malta* is, I think, disputable. Lack of space prevents a detailed account of the author's thesis for each play and a detailed statement of such objections as occur. Briefly, she considers that the career and personality of *Faustus* shadows that of Giordano Bruno; that *Tamburlaine* similarly alludes to the American projects of Raleigh and his group; that *The Jew of Malta* is to be associated with the activities of the Catholic League, and the character of Barabbas with that of Philip II of Spain. In the course of this exposition much interesting material is brought together on all three of these personalities, as well as on the questions of the American schemes, the history of the League and the contemporary English attitude to both. The emphasis she lays on the poetic imagination of Raleigh and her deep regard for the mind and character of Harriott (whom she considers the inspirational centre of the group) will be welcomed by all readers who have studied the thought of these two men. But I do not feel convinced that the fact of what we may broadly term 'inspiration' establishes the presence of 'fustian' in her strict sense. There seems, in this second part, to be a confusion between the use of veiled topical allusion and the imagistic process by which sources are transmuted, a process common to all dramatic artists from Aeschylus to O'Neill. That Bruno and Raleigh, scientific thought and American adventure should inspire Marlowe is not strange; given the peculiar quality of Marlowe's mind, it would have been strange indeed if they had not. Doubtless the thought of Raleigh brought to life in Marlowe's imagination the records of Timur (and for drawing our attention to this probability we owe the author our gratitude), but surely it was rather as the thought of his mistress might bring to life for a man the myth of Aphrodite? This is not 'fustian', or, if it is, all drama (and perhaps all other art) is in some degree 'fustian', inasmuch as his knowledge of actual people has gone into the artist's imaginary figures; what we call his 'creation' is often found, when we have the evidence of note-books, letters and journals, such as those of Hebbel, Ibsen and Tchekov, to be rooted in his imaginative experience of actual people. The more closely we examine such records, the clearer it becomes that actual personalities, events, modes of thought may be the ultimate sources of works of art, but that a process of fusion and transmutation operating deep in the imagination has removed it from the category of conscious, veiled allusion. The basic fabric of a

great work of art is not an elaborately wrought tissue of such things as these. Even in the few, rare cases where allusion or satire was at first intended, imaginative creation will be found to have taken possession and swept aside that intention as often as the resulting achievement is an organism, a work of art. Who contends that *Joseph Andrews* is no more than a satire on *Pamela*?

The author remarks that some critics refuse to accept this principle of the presence of 'fustian'. They do. But only where great works of art are concerned; and even then, not, as she implies (p. 3) from sentimental reasons, but because of the conclusions reached from prolonged study of artists' records of their own processes and of the testimony that certain of them have given when confronted with this kind of theory. For a more sympathetic view of the relations between the topical or personal and the generic in even the satirical drama of the early seventeenth century, the reader may be referred to Professor O. J. Campbell's *Comicall Satyre* (Huntington Library Publications: 1938). Certain satirical plays (chiefly those of Ben Jonson and Marston) are there considered, in relation to the history of satire both classical and Elizabethan, and the picture revealed thereby not only allows the artist more dignity as a workman but impresses the reader as considerably more credible.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.

**Shakespeare and other Masters.** By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1940; London: H. Milford. 1941. Pp. xvi + 430. \$4.50; 25s. 6d. net.

For more than twenty-five years Professor Stoll has been writing about Shakespeare, and the general nature of his views is well enough known to readers of this Review. His latest volume, in which he reprints studies written for the most part since his *Art and Artifice*, deals with poetic drama as illustrated in the Greeks, in French classical tragedy and in Shakespeare, and is a good example of his methods and views. To begin with, he will have nothing to do with critics who find Shakespeare incomprehensible: 'the only difficulties I find in Shakespeare (apart, of course, from a badly edited and printed text) are owing to: (1) a technique that is now at some points unfamiliar; (2) the dramatist's hasty re-writing of other people's plays, such as *Hamlet*; and above all (3) the incrustation of criticism'.

A good deal of his book is certainly devoted to this last difficulty. Both in his general chapters, such as that on 'Reconciliation in



Tragedy', or in his special studies, such as those on Hamlet or Iago, Professor Stoll continuously attacks what he conceives to be false criticism. He is always insistent on the dramatic and poetic qualities of his material: delicate psychological delineations he brushes aside as figments of the modern imagination; interpretations which parade an elaborate apparatus of Elizabethan documents, books, occurrences or beliefs are rated as more likely to confuse than to aid the critic. He has little use for those subtle and super-subtle studies in imagery, or those which seize on single words or phrases, and attribute to them what he thinks to be undue importance or unusual and recondite meanings. 'The play's the thing', and Professor Stoll insists on our looking at the play, and upon our remembering that the business of the drama is character in action. Unless we do this, we are liable, he says, to fall into the heresy of 'the psychological method, foreign to the Elizabethan stage and not native even to ours, a method of literary criticism rather than of dramatic practice.' By so doing we join those critics who 'are not witnessing the play, but reading it. Nay, they are re-reading it, are poring and puzzling over it, and in the light of what they find, or think that they find in say the soliloquy at the end of Act II they turn against Hamlet what he incidentally says about the Danish national fault in Act I, Scene IV'. All this, of course, is a reaction against much of the criticism of the past fifty years, and is a salutary warning to those of us nourished on Bradley and others, who are inclined to discuss the psychology of the hero, and the many flaws and inconsistencies in the characters, as though they were actual persons. 'Hamlet, Othello, Lear, Falstaff are what they seem: unlike men of flesh and blood that is all they are.'

Everywhere one turns, Professor Stoll arrests the attention by the wealth of material he handles and by the challenge he gives to many of our strongly held opinions. That his views are not more widely known is largely owing to difficulties of his own making. He is not an easy writer to follow; often a bewildering tangle of clauses, parentheses, inversions and the rest have to be unravelled before his meaning is clear, while the mass of characters and incidents quoted from plays of all ages and countries does little to make matters easier. Those difficulties are to be found in this present volume, although it is distinctly easier to read than some earlier books of Professor Stoll. The enterprising reader, however, will not be put off by these difficulties, but will realize that an important body of criticism is to be drawn from a study of the pages of this book. H. S. BENNETT.

**Shakespeare and Democracy.** By ALWIN THALER. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. 1941. Pp. xii+312. \$2.50.

One takes up this book with pleasure, for it is a beautifully made volume. And one is not disappointed with the contents, which are varied and interesting. Mr. Thaler writes attractively, with a deft touch. He gives us a number of essays on different topics connected with Elizabethan drama, some of them revisions of previously published papers. They are arranged in three sections, (1) Revaluations: Critical and Historical, (2) 'Country' Plays and Strolling Players, (3) Poets, Plays, and Actors. The book takes its title from the first essay in (1).

The first two essays are closely related—*Shakespeare and Democracy* and *Shakespeare and Walt Whitman*. It is an elementary fact that democracy in the full sense in which we understand the term to-day is a conception which did not exist in the political ideology of Shakespeare's time: but is it right to assail Shakespeare as fundamentally anti-democratic in spirit? Hazlitt condemned *Coriolanus* because, he said, its 'whole dramatic moral . . . is that those who have little shall have less, and that those who have much shall take all that others have left'. Mr. Thaler, allowing that 'Shakespeare weighs the case unfairly against the Plebs', nevertheless maintains that 'we can interpret *Coriolanus* as an unqualifiedly anti-democratic document only if we disregard the fact that in the end Shakespeare allows the inexorable logic of events to bring Coriolanus, the arch-hater of the people, to absolute and dismal failure, to a futile and miserable death'. Shakespeare and his age feared as among the most grievous calamities possible a recurrence of the anarchy of a civil war such as that out of which the Tudor monarchy arose: they clung to the conception of the Tudor type of despotism as a safeguard against this. Shakespeare, in the words of Mr. Thaler, 'tended to see in any popular uprising the dangerous potentiality of mob rule'. We cannot doubt that Shakespeare is giving his own views in the statement of the doctrine of 'degree' found in the famous speech of Ulysses in *Troilus and Cressida*, I, iii, 75 ff. 'Degree', firmly established and maintained hierarchical order, is a prime necessity in human society as in the physical universe—this is at the heart of Shakespeare: but does it mean that Walt Whitman was justified in saying of Shakespeare's works (among others) that they 'are poisonous to the idea of the pride and dignity of the common people, the life blood of democracy'? Mr. Thaler sees things in due proportion. Shakespeare's

fear of the turmoil of popular uprising by no means exceeds his hatred of tyrannical oppression: his 'studies in English history', says Mr. Thaler, 'emphasize the point that each of the three estates—king, nobles *and* commons—has its own integral rights in the state. While these rights are safeguarded, each estate contributes to the strength of the whole; if and when the rights of one of the three are violated the whole structure tends to fall'. If the case is weighed against the commons in *Coriolanus* it is not so in *Richard III*: and in *Coriolanus* itself 'the chicanery of demagogues is given no more prominence than the insensate pride of birth and privilege'. It is all a matter of proportion, as Mr. Thaler appreciates. Henry V is portrayed by Shakespeare as an ideal king. He owes his position to an act of usurpation: but he justifies his kingship by his consciousness of a common humanity with his subjects. Mr. Thaler says well that 'democracy, like Christianity, is built upon the rock: the supreme validity of the individual soul': it cannot then be said that Shakespeare was anti-democratic.

Mr. Thaler's first two essays are of great interest for the light they shed on the views on Shakespeare expressed by great figures in American history. Particularly interesting are those of Whitman. Mr. Thaler refers to Whitman's contention that the 'undemocratic' Shakespeare must be distasteful to a modern democratic reader: this was part of a larger condemnation—the contention that Americans should have no use for any of the poetry inherited from the European past, all of which related to and rested upon 'conditions, standards, politics, sociologies, ranges of belief, that have been quite eliminated from the Eastern Hemisphere, and never existed at all in the Western'; it was 'grown not for America, but rather for her foes, the feudal and the old'. Whitman's indictment of literature up to his time is that it 'has never recognized the people': this is like Hazlitt's denunciation—'The cause of the people is indeed but little calculated as a subject for poetry. . . . The language of poetry naturally falls in with the language of power'. This side of Whitman is well enough known; but Mr. Thaler points to the other side, not so well known. How true is his statement that 'in criticism . . . as in everyday journalism, it is the sensational utterance that wins public notice, while the corrections, the sober second thoughts, are usually disregarded'! At other times Whitman voiced opinions contrary to those mentioned: earlier he had said that 'poets are the voice and exposition of liberty', and later he saw that 'if we are not to hospitably

receive and complete the inauguration of the old civilizations, and change their small scale to the largest, broadest scale, what on earth are we for?' This is surely the saner view. Criticism has for too long emphasized Whitman's strictures on 'the old poetry' in general, and on Shakespeare in particular, as anti-democratic and of no use to a democratic audience (in Mr. Thaler's second essay reputable Whitman scholars are cited as falling into this error); Mr. Thaler has performed a great service by setting the balance right, by showing that the other view was equally characteristic of Whitman. Whitman was inconsistent in this matter, but it was with what Mr. Thaler calls 'the creative inconsistency of life itself': and Whitman knew it. Mr. Thaler quotes him—'Do I contradict myself?':

Very well then I contradict myself,  
( I am large, I contain multitudes).

Just as criticism has frequently remembered one view of Whitman on Shakespeare and not the other, so, though to a lesser extent, with Ben Jonson. If Jonson said that Shakespeare 'wanted art', he also said, addressing him, that

He

Who casts to write a living line must sweat  
(Such as thine are) and strike the second heat  
Upon the Muses' anvil. . . .

In his essay on *Shakespeare on Style, Imagination, and Poetry* Mr. Thaler sets out to controvert the view of Shakespeare as stylistically un-self-conscious, and there is no doubt that he is quite right to do so. I cannot help feeling that at times his argument is just a little naïve, as for example when, claiming that 'Shakespeare dared to look upon his work and at once see and say that it was good', he instances passages such as

*Duke.* How dost thou like this tune?  
*Viola.* It gives a very echo to the seat  
Where Love is throned.  
*Duke.* Thou dost speak masterly.

Is this Shakespeare directly praising as 'masterly' his own lines? Yet, however this may be, Mr. Thaler's general conclusion is the right one, agreeing with Bradley that 'inspiration is surely not incompatible with considerate workmanship'; with Granville-Barker that the art Shakespeare 'wanted' was only 'a scheme of consistent principles and a studied method of expressing them', and that 'there is an aspect of him which turns towards pure beauty of form, and the

discipline and the limitations involved'; and with Coleridge that 'Shakespeare, no mere child of nature; no automaton of genius; no passive vehicle of inspiration possessed by the spirit . . . first studied patiently, meditated deeply, understood minutely, till knowledge, become habitual and intuitive, wedded itself to his habitual feelings, and at length gave birth to that stupendous power, by which he stands alone.' These critics express the matter so well that I am not quite sure that Mr. Thaler's essay was really necessary; but again he appreciates the balanced view.

Space forbids me to deal specifically with Mr. Thaler's other essays, with, for instance, his endeavour to refute Quincy Adams's claim that three scenes have been lost from *Macbeth*, with his reasonable contention that the Hero-Claudio story in *Much Ado* owes something to Spenser, with his convincing demonstration that Malvolio is a portrait of 'William Ffarington, Esquire (1537-1610), of Worden, Lancashire, steward (until 1594) to Lord Ferdinando Strange, Earl of Derby and patron of Shakespeare's company', with his discussion of *Faire Em* as a play acted by Lord Strange's Men in Lancashire in the late 1580's, with his able study of the conditions under which players travelled in the provinces in Shakespeare's England, and with other interesting topics with which he deals. I must content myself with saying that, whereas the quality of the essays varies, the whole book is packed with material which should prove of great value to students of Elizabethan drama.

G. I. DUTHIE.

**Some Seventeenth-Century Worthies in a Twentieth-Century Mirror.** By R. BALFOUR DANIELS. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1940. London: H. Milford. 1941. Pp. xii+156. \$2.00; 12s. 6d. net.

This is essentially a book of informative entertainment or popularizing instruction. The dust-cover tells us that 'the author strolls through the rich fields of seventeenth-century literature with no other motive than a contemplative enjoyment of whatever strikes his fancy', and it is evident that he has a good capacity for such enjoyment. He has powers of perception too, but keeps their exercise well within the limits appropriate to his holiday mood, and is content to range rather than to delve, offering impressions of twenty-two 'worthies', from Burton to Pepys and from Crashaw to Halifax, in

essays which average less than seven pages in length. He is, therefore, unlikely to tire any of his readers save those who do not care for a meal of *hors d'œuvres* or those who will take nothing upon trust. Here we learn why it is that *The Rule and Exercise of Holy Dying* has lost its former popularity: modern heterodoxy, agnosticism, and scientifically determined thinking are hostile to the purpose it represents, and 'none of the beauties of its style, nor its scholarly manner, nor even the tender and helpful Christian sentiments expressed therein can bring this book back into favour'. We learn also that 'Thomas Traherne is about as different from Chaucer as a poet could be', a sentence introducing reflections on Traherne's unfortunate habit of 'introspective sentimentality'. And we are warned not to be taken in by the specious attractions of Sir Thomas Browne's style, of which 'the hypnotic effect is quite disarming, and unless the reader is on his guard he will not detect the worthy doctor's lapses into ridiculous and superstitious nonsense'.

These brief essays will no doubt have an appeal and a value for those desiring to know a little about the ways and interests of the quaint people who wrote books three hundred years ago, and some readers may well be led on to seek a closer acquaintance with figures of whom this 'mirror' provides such fleeting glimpses. There is, at any rate, no need to doubt the critical competence of one who can re-state as follows the doctrine of 'what oft was thought but ne'er so well express'd': 'when we read [Vaughan's] phrase, "A way where you might tread the sun", it occasions no surprise but seems rather an unfamiliar but anticipated pleasure, the work of high and articulate genius'.

The price of this slender volume may seem over-high even for war-time, and therefore it must be added that expense and pains have clearly not been spared to make the book an artistic credit to its publishers.

L. C. MARTIN.

### The Art of Biography in Eighteenth-Century England.

By DONALD A. STAUFFER. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 1941. 2 vols. vol. I, pp. xiv + 572; vol. II, pp. viii + 293. \$8.50; £2 11s.

Dr. Stauffer, whose *English Biography Before 1700* appeared in 1930, has now extended his survey to the eighteenth century—a period, as he remarks, in which 'writing biographies was a natural pastime and



a national art'. If he may not say, 'I first adventure; follow me who list', he has already done more than any living scholar to open up a half-neglected field of English letters. This new study provides a comparatively untrodden approach to the eighteenth century, and brings to notice many fascinating and forgotten personalities; but, as in his earlier volume, it is with the art of biography that he is chiefly concerned. His work is therefore to be judged mainly by his success or failure in presenting a clear picture of the development of biography as a literary form. There was no doubt of his achievement in the earlier study; but for one reason or another he has not been quite so successful in the volume under review. One closes this book grateful to the author for considerable additions to one's knowledge, for much good-humoured entertainment, and for many admirable critical judgments; yet the pattern of the argument is not invariably clear, and the growth of biography as an art is too often hidden beneath an excessive description or discussion of individual examples. Good as it is, this book might easily have been even better.

It may well be that Dr. Stauffer found his material intractable. The biography of this period, ranging as it does from Curll's wretched post-mortems to Boswell's *Life* and from John Wesley's *Journal* to Laetitia Pilkington's *Memoirs*, is indeed a disorderly growth. Even so, the plan of the book is less satisfactory than it should be; the divisions occasionally appear to be arbitrary. The opening chapter is entitled 'Biography and the Drama', and Dr. Stauffer seeks to show the influence of the drama on the biographer's art. Frankly, a good deal of this section appears to be designed to enable the author to discuss together some of the best biographies of the century, which happen to be by, or to be about, actors. The chapter which follows, 'Biography and the Novel', has more critical justification; but the third ('Biography and the Romantic Spirit') and the fourth ('Knowledge Infinite: Eccentrics and Antiquaries') again suggest rather artificial divisions. Dr. Stauffer wavers, too, between scholarly commentary and popular exposition, and between the minute investigation and the general survey. The material with which he has to deal is often so entertaining, so eminently quotable, that he has sometimes yielded to the temptation of lingering too long over sprightly works of minor importance. Indeed, it is probably the fullness of quotation more than any other single factor that has occasionally obscured the trend of the argument. In the chapter dealing with Johnson and Boswell, for instance, nine pages (pp. 416-25) are given

up to commenting upon and illustrating their respect for truth: the point is admittedly an important one, but need it have been made so often? A quotation of sixteen lines on p. 393 from Thomas Adam's *Private thoughts on religion* is repeated verbatim on p. 497; but this is only a more glaring example of much avoidable repetition. One may be allowed to protest, too, against a strain of facetiousness which the author appears to have caught from some of the biographers he discusses. Dr. Stauffer is determined not to be dull, but there was never any danger of that, and he writes so well that it is a pity he occasionally tries to force the pace.

In the final chapter he remarks that there was little critical discussion during the eighteenth century on the style and form of biography. It is perhaps just as well. The critics would probably have demanded that biography should present general truths; whereas (and this is one of many excellent critical points made by Dr. Stauffer) the public sought 'not the general in biography, but the particular, not the similarities in Chesterfield and Johnson, but their differences' (p. 495), and the more particulars Boswell could give, the better he, and his public, were pleased. In assessing the growing curiosity about the private lives of others Dr. Stauffer might have found some useful evidence of what was happening in the mind of the average Englishman if he had taken into account the influence of the newspapers. At the beginning of the century both Addison and Swift satirize the daily and weekly journals for publishing accounts of purely domestic events: there was still a feeling in Queen Anne's day that news was something that came from Paris or the Hague, and that the journalists had recourse to murders and elopements only in a dearth of news. As the century advances the need to satisfy a human curiosity about the doings of one's neighbours becomes more noticeable in the London and provincial newspapers. Dr. Stauffer might have found, too, a considerable amount of actual biography in the weekly journals: the death of Marlborough, for instance, called forth biographical notices of some length.

One or two minor slips and omissions may be noted. Tate Wilkinson is commended for a penetrating observation about Garrick (I, 62): 'Mr. Garrick was an actor on the stage of life; and on the stage itself he was not the actor, but life's exact mirror he held to public view.' Surely the credit for this antithesis must be given to Goldsmith, who had already made the same point more neatly in his *Retaliation*. On p. 500 an epigram is quoted: 'Sir, in your funeral

talk I'm griev'd . . .'; it may be pointed out that this epigram is obviously Pope's 'Friend! in your epitaphs I'm griev'd. . .'. The second of Dr. Stauffer's two volumes is a full and valuable bibliography of eighteenth-century biographies, briefly and often amusingly annotated by the author. Occasionally his curiosity has deserted him. Under Leonard Welsted he lists 'Oikographia', 1725, with the note: 'An autobiographical poem.—*DNB*.' Had he turned up this poem in J. Nichols's edition of Welsted's *Works* he would hardly have listed it among eighteenth-century autobiographies. The entry under WELWOOD is odd: 'WELWOOD, [James?]. Rowe's *Works*, 1766, vol. 1 of 2 vols., contains: "The life of Nicholas Rowe, Esq.;" extracted from Dr. Welwood's account prefixed to Rowe's tr. of Lucan.' Why cite this late eighteenth-century edition of Rowe's *Works*, and, indeed, why not cite Rowe's translation of Lucan, 1718 [i.e. 1719], where Dr.—James it is—Welwood's *Life* first appeared? As a biographer, indeed, Dr. Stauffer is rather too offhand; it is to be hoped that the chatty bibliography so devastatingly exemplified some years ago in Mr. R. Straus's *The Unspeakable Curll* is not now coming into fashion. For Lord Hervey, Romney Sedgwick's edition (1931) of the *Memoirs* should have been listed; it contains material not to be had in Croker. The note on *Characters of the Times*, 1728, is misleading. 'The author', it is remarked, 'cannot restore the Dunciad enemies of Pope'. The author was not trying to do so; his book was published some weeks before the *Dunciad*, and was intended to reinstate those authors who had been ridiculed in 'The Art of Sinking'. Not much of importance appears to have escaped Dr. Stauffer's notice in his bibliography; but one may add one really interesting autobiography, Richard Burridge's *Religio Libertini*; or, *The Faith of a Converted Atheist*, and one theatrical biography, *Memoirs of Theophilus Keene*, 1718, which has been attributed to Richard Savage. Additional titles of the Methodist biographies might have been given; but those are perhaps indicated in the author's note to John Wesley (p. 264).

If it was necessary to make some reservations, it is equally necessary for the reviewer to state clearly that in those two volumes Dr. Stauffer has made a contribution of first-class importance to the study of English biography. Both volumes are packed with information, and on every other page one finds new reasons for admiring the author's neatly-turned comments and considered judgments on the works, great and small, with which he has to deal. One may note

particularly the discriminating commentary on Tate Wilkinson's *Memoirs* and Colley Cibber's *Apology*. Wilkinson, 'slightly harassed, tangled in his own weird syntax, and full of a great self-pity' (p. 64) certainly deserves to be better known, if not, perhaps, to be reprinted. This century, so rich in coxcombs who could write fluently but not always grammatically, provides good material for Dr. Stauffer's unsentimental and yet rarely unsympathetic appraisal. Of Cibber he writes admirably that his *Apology* is satisfying 'because it fulfills his purpose; it treats a little subject in a little way'; and again: 'The paradox which makes his book fascinating is that in spite of his outward assurance, fundamentally he lacks conviction, certainty, standards. He lets others judge him; he does not know how to judge himself.' Such penetrating *aperçus* come frequently in Dr. Stauffer's pages; he is indeed a critic of real sensitiveness and ability.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

**The Drapier's Letters and other Works, 1724-1725.** By JONATHAN SWIFT. Edited by Herbert Davis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 1941. Pp. xxxi + 222. 12s. net.

This excellent edition of Swift's prose works is to be completed in fourteen volumes. The publication of volumes X and XI, following upon I-III, leaves a gap in the sequence; but the general reader reaps an advantage, for it was as the Drapier and as Gulliver (volumes X and XI) that Swift won his widest contemporary fame. Furthermore there are points of relationship between the home-staying political shopkeeper and the widely travelled ship's surgeon, for, as Professor Davis observes, 'the travels of Gulliver were actually interrupted by the activities of the Drapier'. Three of Gulliver's voyages had been written during the years 1721-1723. The third voyage, the last to be composed, was lying to Swift's hand, in the early part of 1724, when he suddenly adopted another rôle and, in a wholly different guise, assumed leadership of Ireland's agitation against the imposition, without consent, of a new and unwanted coinage. He became the hero of the hour; and to this day the name of Dean Swift is remembered by Irishmen who can give no account of what he did.

In 1722 William Wood, an English manufacturer, was granted a patent by the Crown to coin over one hundred thousand pounds worth of small change for Ireland. Within a few weeks the Commissioners of the Revenue in Dublin questioned the wisdom of the

grant, protesting that there was no real shortage of copper currency. In the following year both Houses of the Irish Parliament presented addresses to the King against the patent. Pamphlets accusing Wood of fraud, of coining base money, injurious to trade and security, began to appear. It was at this stage that Swift entered the lists with a *Letter to the Shopkeepers* written in simple language directed to the common intelligence. This and the letters which followed, although they were not the best reasoned of pamphlets written against Wood's patent, did more than anything else to fan the flame of popular indignation. Carteret, who had been sent over as Lord Lieutenant to save the credit of the government, had the wisdom to realize that the storm would not overblow, and he counselled surrender. Just over three years after the grant of Wood's patent its cancellation was publicly announced. It was an outstanding triumph, carrying with it wider implications than the originating cause, and, as everybody knew, from Carteret to blackguard boys in the street, the victory was Swift's.

Professor Davis's introduction is admirably adapted to guide the reader through the political ferment which agitated Dublin, and indeed all Ireland, during the years 1722-1725. There was much that passed beneath the surface, and the whole story is not always easy to follow, although the main outline is never in doubt. In this new edition of the *Drapier's Letters* Professor Davis has had the advantage of the researches he made for his edition of the letters published by the Clarendon Press in 1935. As in that edition he has devoted particular attention to producing a sound text—a task previously neglected. Five of the letters, printed as scrubby little pamphlets, appeared in 1724. Two letters, known as the sixth and seventh, were held back, and first appeared in the fourth volume of Faulkner's edition of the Dean's *Works*, 1735. Textual alterations in this volume, in which the seven letters were brought together, indicate conclusively that the revision was by Swift himself. We cannot be sure that the original pamphlets always represent what he wrote at the time, for there is evidence that his friends introduced modifications, nor, on the other hand, can we accept Faulkner's text as a restoration of the very words he penned during the perils of the conflict. But the text of 1735, embodying the author's last touches of revision, has a prior claim, and from it Professor Davis reprints the letters, adding full textual collations, which, with the introduction and the appendixes, give to this edition a special value for the scholar.

A few comments may be added. Is Professor Davis justified in suggesting that the quarto edition of Letter I, of which a single copy only survives, was probably a trial printing? It bears no imprint, but the fount of type used is not characteristic of Harding, who printed the Dublin pamphlets. A Limerick edition of the second letter is known, and the quarto edition of the first letter may also have been printed in that town, or elsewhere outside Dublin. There were two Dublin editions of the second letter. The facsimile of the title-page appearing in this volume is that in which the imprint contains the words 'in *Fishamble-Street*'. There is some probability that the edition which omits these words from the title can claim priority. The reproduction of Faulkner's frontispiece to Volume IV of the *Works*, 1735, seems to have been taken from the duodecimo, not from the octavo edition. The reference in the second footnote on p. xv to 'pp. 202-3' should be corrected to '210-11'; the reference on p. xvi, first footnote, should be 'p. 211', not '203'; and that in the second footnote on p. xxvii to 'pp. 204-5' should be '213-14'. In the textual notes to Letter IV, p. 53, l. 18, second column, read 'proceeds' for 'proceed'.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**Gulliver's Travels, 1726.** By JONATHAN SWIFT. Edited by Herbert Davis, with an Introduction by Harold Williams, 1941. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Pp. xxxviii (Introduction)+xliv+316. 12s. net.

The great value of this edition of *Gulliver's Travels* (the handsomely printed Volume XI of the Shakespeare Head Swift) is that it gives not only the text of Faulkner's Dublin edition of 1735, but the variant readings of the earlier editions, of the Ford list of Errata, of the corrected pages in the Ford copy, and of the notes in the Armagh Library copy and the Carrol Wilson Second Volume, the latter two being contributed by Mr. Harold Williams. Readers of Swift will be grateful for these careful minute collations.

Mr. Harold Williams in a short but detailed and comprehensive Introduction, points out that *Gulliver's Travels* went through three editions in the year of its publication, 1726. A second edition appeared in 1727 and two Dublin editions. Swift complained to his friend Ford that Motte, the printer, had 'mingled and mangled' his text, especially in Part IV, and supplied him first with a list of errata, then with revised and recast versions of four longish passages and



several short ones which Ford transcribed on interleaved pages in his large paper *Gulliver* of 1726. George Faulkner corrected all the mistakes and inserted all the revised passages but one—the account of how the people of Lindalino brought to nought the plans of the King of Laputa for their destruction (III. 3), which did not reach print till Temple Scott's edition.

Mr. Williams thinks Mr. Davis right in printing from the text of 1735. He has another reason for preferring it: he thinks Swift corrected his works as they were passing through Faulkner's press, and while Mr. Davis doubts if this is true of them all, he allows it to be true of *Gulliver's Travels*. At least he thought so when he first worked over the text, but at the last moment he seems to have hesitated; and, perhaps under the influence of Professor Case, who edited *Gulliver* in 1938, and has privately communicated his views, he has come round to the view that in about twenty small verbal points, an earlier text is preferable.

Two questions arise: Is he right in the main to prefer the Faulkner text? From an examination of his list of variants the answer seems to be Yes. Professor Case holds that, if there was correction, it was perfunctory. On the contrary it seems to me methodical, not indeed a correction that affects the writing essentially, but such as any author might make who wanted to polish up a little and could disregard printers' costs. He gets rid of slight roughnesses: 't-other' (1726) becomes 'the other' (1735); the king's 'biggest' library becomes his 'largest' library; the 'rest' of Glumdalclitch's books becomes the 'latter'. He makes the meaning more definite: cp. 1735, 'I twisted three of the Iron Bars together, bending the extremities into a Hook' (1726, 'binding', Armagh, 'turning'); 'a sleeping Potion' (1726 'sleepy'); Gulliver in 1735 walks 'to the end of this field', not 'to this end of the Field'; the Dwarf never failed of a 'smart' word in 1735 ('small', 1726). He frequently changes 'that' to 'who' in sentences like, 'many stragglers who might remain in the streets'. He prefers the subjunctive regularly in clauses like 'although it were' (1726, 'was'). The Blue Red and Green threads of Lilliput were Purple, Yellow and White in 1726, probably without Swift's permission. I am not sure that the change from the Horn and Crown for an inn in a market town to The Green Eagle was a desirable elegance.

The reasons for the larger changes are obvious. The revolt of Lindalino at the end of Part III, Chap. 3, has no parallel in 1726, and the satire of the Chief Minister of State (IV, 6) had been mangled

out of recognition. In the other two revised passages the style becomes more direct and deadly. In the attack on lawyers (IV, 6) in 1726, he muffles himself up in long sentences, seeming almost to mock the drone of a pleader at the bar: in 1735 he strikes like lightning: 'I said there was a society of Men among us, bred up from their Youth in the Art of proving by Words multiplied for the Purpose, that White is Black and Black is White, according as they are paid: To this Society all the Rest of the People are Slaves'. That last sentence in 1726 ran: 'The Greatness of these Mens Assurance and the Boldness of their Pretensions gained upon the Vulgar, whom in a Manner they made Slaves of'. The satire of plots and conspiracies in Part III, Chap. 6 (1726) is ironical. Gulliver tells the Professor that if he ever lived in a Kingdom where Plots and Conspiracies were in vogue he would encourage the breed of Discoverers, Witnesses, Informers, Accusers, Prosecutors, Evidences, Swearers, and he would put them under some dextrous Persons. The directness of 'I told him that in the Kingdom of Tribnia . . . the Bulk of the People consisted wholly of Discoverers etc.', is more startling. In the sentences that follow he girds up his style, firing two to the second where before he had fired once.

The second question is more ticklish: Ought Mr. Davis in 21 places to prefer an early reading to that of 1735? The answer is again, Yes. Swift was not a careful proof-reader, and therefore his editor should not consider himself an absolute slave to one text. 'Chestnuts and other Maste or Vegetables' (1726) is preferable to 'Chestnuts and other Masts or Vegetables'; 'rapt in Speculation' to 'wrapped in Speculation'; and 'My Daughter kneeled to ask my Blessing' to 'me Blessing'. It may be worth pointing out by the way that the 1747 (Charles Bathurst) edition drew upon the Ford pages and nearly always preferred them to the 1735 edition when there was a difference.

A hundred years hence this *Gulliver* will give the bibliographers some *maste* to chew. The title-page reads: *Gulliver's Travels*, 1726, With an Introduction by Harold Williams. Since the 1735 Text is given, one expects 1735. One expects, too, the name of the editor on the title-page. It is on the cover and dust-cover, but appears nowhere within the boards.

W. D. TAYLOR.

**Epic Suggestion in the Imagery of the Waverley Novels.**

By CHRISTABEL F. FISKE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.  
 London: Humphrey Milford, 1940. Pp. xxvi+141. \$2.50; 15s. 6d.  
 net.

Professor Christabel Fiske has undertaken to demonstrate the epic strain in the imagery of Scott's novels, that is, one side of that Homeric quality which, in her opinion, has not been emphasized as much as the romantic quality. One may question that opinion, just as one may hesitate to oppose the terms *Homeric* and *romantic*: the average educated reader, to whom she refers, is, it might be thought, fully conscious of the Homeric strain both in Scott's mind and in his imagery. But it is pleasant to have the passages which illustrate her argument collected in this fashion, and the argument itself is as sound, in the main, as her enjoyment of the novels. Certain forced parallels and slips of fact may perhaps be pointed out. On p. 100 the wild bull of the *Iliad* affords no real parallel to the tame oxen of the passages from Scott; on the other hand, the parallel between Antinous and Rashleigh Osbaldistone (pp. 41-5) is admirably made out, as is also the humorous parody, in Morton's return, of the directions given by Circe to Odysseus (pp. 2-3). On p. 4 an odd account is given of *Skirnesmöl*, and Gerör was hardly a grim giantess; on p. 11 a hare's *form* is explained as its *burrow*—one hesitates to imagine Scott's comment on this; on p. 16 the palmerworm and the locust are borrowed from the prophet Joel, and the owl and the cricket from *Macbeth*—neither metaphor springs, as the author suggests, from Scott's lively and ingenious fancy; on p. 18 it is hardly fair to class Moses and Aaron among Egyptian magicians, even though Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And Balfour of Kinloch, called Burley, was not an English gentleman (p. 84). There are also some unnecessary difficulties in the use of technical terminology, and some strange phrases. Professor Fiske's application of *delightful*, *charming* and their nouns and adverbs is sometimes difficult to follow: in what way, for instance, is the 'mountain analogue' on p. 9 'delightful', or the wild-geese simile on p. 28 'charming'? The one is too portentous and the other too harsh for either word. When all this is said, however, there remains the fact, which is sufficient praise for the book, that it succeeds in its aim of indicating the heroic magnanimity of Scott's imagination.

EDITH C. BATHO.

**New Poems by Hartley Coleridge, including a selection from his published poetry.** Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. xxii+135. 10s. 6d. net.

Some day the literary democracies will draw up an Atlantic Charter and combine their forces to overthrow the Dictatorship of the Publishers. The habit of telling the reader what he ought to think of the book before he has had a chance to open it is a growing menace, and the present dust-cover affords a particularly irritating example. The author, we are told, 'was so much a part of the Romantic movement that his poems are interesting for that reason, as well as for their own sweetness and limpidity'. The sweetness and limpidity are undeniable, but if Hartley Coleridge was part of the Romantic movement he lived and died in ignorance of the fact. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, who is not without a following, has contended for years that there never was a Romantic movement, and if he and the anonymous dogmatist are both right it must follow that Hartley Coleridge, being part of nothing, was a mathematical impossibility. The question admits of difference of opinion, and, until the New Order in Criticism is established, the reader will prefer to form his opinion for himself.

In the meantime it is possible to believe in the reality of the Romantic movement and to feel at the same time that Hartley Coleridge was no more a part of it than he was a part of the Industrial Revolution. His sprightliness, his metrical skill, his taste in graveyards, his delight in the elegant, the ingenious and the trivial, would have been better appreciated in the age of Johnson, and would have commended him to the editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. He would probably, if we may judge by his *Northern Worthies*, have entered the wider fields of history and biography, and, with light verse as a hobby, have succeeded well enough in supporting existence. Another advantage of belonging to his grandfather's generation would have been that he would, presumably, have lived in Devonshire, and breathed the native air of the Coleridge family. That he adapted himself as well as he did to the rugged populations of Westmorland and the West Riding of Yorkshire is a fact to his credit, and proves that his friends did not altogether deceive themselves when they spoke of his personal charm; but in the Rectory of Ottery St. Mary his lovable qualities would have found their natural environment.

Intellectually, Hartley Coleridge had little in common with his father, and it is not as faint reflections of his father's genius but as

revelations of himself that his poems are worth preserving. We do not expect him to be always inspired, any more than his friends expected him to be always brilliant, but, remembering that we can put him back on the shelf if his charm should grow tiresome, we should like as much of him as possible to be available. In the matter of quantity the present edition is a little disappointing. Professor Griggs tells us that in the principal collection alone, that of the Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge, he found nearly three hundred unpublished poems, besides 'a number of manuscripts in private hands or public libraries', all of which were placed at his disposal. Judging by the author's usual practice we may reasonably assume that the average length does not much exceed that of a sonnet, so that the whole three hundred—if we may take that to be the approximate total—could have been printed in little more than half that number of pages. Actually the 'unpublished and uncollected poems' are confined to the last of three sections, comprising rather less than half the book, the first two sections being devoted to poems published by the author himself in 1833 or by Derwent Coleridge in 1851. The total number of new discoveries, including some additions gleaned from periodicals or culled from Derwent Coleridge's *Memoir* of his brother, is sixty-one.

Professor Griggs does not explain this parsimony. He merely tells us that the present edition 'is a selection from both the unpublished and published poetry of Hartley Coleridge, and every effort has been made to choose those poems most representative of the poet's genius'. It may be interesting to recall that in 1835, when the poet must have seemed to be far from the height of his career, a certain Robert Fletcher Housman published a small volume of English sonnets 'from the time of Henry Howard Earl of Surrey to the present day inclusive', and, with this vast field of choice before him, included no less than seven of the sonnets of Hartley Coleridge. Of those seven only three are found in the present volume. If the large number of still unpublished poems afford as much scope for diversity of taste it is to be hoped that Professor Griggs does not consider his work complete. Perhaps, in the conditions of to-day, restrictions on the use of paper may have made some kind of compromise necessary; though there is an air of spacious amplitude about these half-filled pages, reminiscent of a more sumptuous age, which seems to forbid that explanation.

The Introduction includes a brief but competent appraisal of

the merits of Hartley Coleridge as a man and as a poet. He was usually an impatient writer, depending on the inspiration of the moment, so that 'his chief excellence lies in single lines, in brief passages, or in short poems, and he gives almost no examples of sustained poetic power'. Most readers will agree also that 'the sonnet . . . was his forte, and upon it must rest his reputation as a poet'.

A few points of detail suggest themselves for revision. The date as printed in the line 'Written in Leeds, July, 1932' (p. 8) is a hundred years too late. In the lines

not yet half awake  
Till sergeant Memory, with an angry shake  
Tells me where I am

(p. 71) it seems very probable that *sergeant* is an error for *surgent*, especially as the poem is printed from manuscript. The *Oxford Dictionary* gives a late example from George Macdonald's *Diary of an Old Soul*: 'My surgent thought shoots lark-like up to thee'. *Werst*, after *thou* (p. 89), is a misprint for *wert*, and *hugh* (p. 94) for *huge*; and *adorn*, in the line 'Yes—to adorn him with a faith intense' (p. 87), must be an error for *adore*, since the object of the action is the Deity. In the poem *Reasons for Not Writing* (p. 103) the second line should end with a full stop and the fourth with a mark of interrogation; and the misspelling *chrystal*, in the sixth line, might have been corrected. As Hartley Coleridge was excessively fond of the dash, as Professor Griggs observes, he probably intended to use it to end the third stanza of the poem *To Dr. Briggs* (p. 109); in any case the full stop is not required, as the sense continues into the next stanza. In two lines of the poem *To the Old Year* (p. 90) the dashes have been misplaced:

When thou wert born—I think I did intend  
I hope I did not swear that I would mend—

They are required before and after the parenthesis, 'I hope I did not swear'. Professor Griggs expressly claims the right to make changes in the spelling and punctuation of poems published for the first time where the manuscript is obviously in error.

Several of the poems in the second section, taken from Derwent Coleridge's edition, show very wide departures from the familiar text, justified by the authority of 'a better or revised version' existing in manuscript. It might have been an advantage if space could have been found—as apparently it easily could—to print the rejected version for comparison, perhaps in the form of a note. It is usually



very difficult to decide whether a surviving manuscript, which may have been only accidentally preserved, includes the author's final corrections.

P. L. CARVER.

**A Revolution in European Poetry, 1660-1900.** By EMERY NEFF. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1940. Pp. xiv+279. \$3.00; 20s. net.

A book on this theme has long been wanted, for its object is not to summarize the succession of schools of poetry from Racine to the Symbolists—such a scheme would fill many volumes without necessarily filling the gaps in our outlook—but to reveal the immanence and adaptibility of poetic expressiveness; the spiritual communism of human sentiment making its way through over two centuries of transition and development. So this essay amounts to a study of *essential* poetry, or, in other words, of man's spirit keeping pace with the conditions under which he has to live. Since true progress and retrogression transcend national barriers, and since inspiration can thrive only on a sense of our common humanity, no such enquiry could convince, if confined to the history of a single literature.

Has Professor Neff given us what we want? The answer is yes and no.

He has certainly made poetry *live*. That is to say, he has not relegated its study to the consideration of schools and influences; he has even succeeded in avoiding the whole nomenclature of academic criticism; in revenge he has shown how changes in society, politics, economics, religion, and science carried the poets (at least most of them) along the tide, giving them at each stage a different world to envisage, a different self-consciousness to explore. At the same time he has not forgotten that authors are the most highly sensitized of individuals, unaccountable and self-centred as well as responsive. So he has not handled them like chessmen but has looked into their hearts, always remembering that they lived other people's lives in order to live their own. For this reason he has rightly chosen his examples wherever their significance was most manifest, whether in England, France, Germany or Italy. On the whole, French literature seems most often to have served his purpose.

This discriminating and yet comprehensive method sheds an unfamiliar light on the familiar commonplaces of literary history. For instance Professor Neff well explains how Cartesian philosophy taught poets to anatomize our moral characters with as much

precision and regularity as Le Nôtre was designing Versailles, and consequently how Racine learnt to divine the elemental passions fermenting beneath the polished manners of the Court, and to portray them without violating social decorum and the rules of classical drama. Or again, when we approach the decay of Augustan standards, he explains with admirable lucidity how Lessing limited the influence of Aristotle's *Poetics*, insisting that his 'rules' were only generalizations concerning the plays most successful on the Attic stage, whereas Shakespeare was equally within his rights in adapting a different technique to a different theatre. Professor Neff writes with insight as well as condensation when he notes how nineteenth-century poetry began by embracing the horizons widened by science, then protested against its abstractions and desiccating mechanizations, and is now discovering that the universe is 'not only queerer than we suppose, but queerer than we *can* suppose' (J. B. S. Haldane). Then why have poets lost so much of their inspiration in the midst of so many mysteries? Why this 'rift' which Heine felt to be spreading across the culture of Europe, and which has continued to widen ever since? Because, we are told, the research and inventiveness which enlarge the imagination, enhance power and prosperity, and inspire visions of progress, have yet sacrificed the culture and traditions inherent in a smaller scale of living and a less confident outlook, till poets, isolated in a society apparently indifferent to spiritual values, have ceased to write about the world, and turn their eyes inward on to their own subjective experiences.

Professor Neff is not only helpful when explaining the fluctuations of the European mind; he is equally good at glimpsing the individual lives which mirrored it. Possibly his best biography is Goethe's, especially his glance at the evolution of *Faust*, and his hint why 'Goethe's insights pointed towards Darwin'. But he is just as welcome in his notes on Winckelmann's, Blake's, and Verlaine's careers which we take for granted and on some others which we forget, for instance Herder, Hölderlin, and Heine. These sketches do not, of course, impart knowledge which is new, but knowledge which is unfamiliar. So with his quotations. The pages are somewhat overloaded with them, and many could be excised without loss, but some others are none the less valuable for being too little known. Goethe's 'prose hymn' (c. 1782 but never published) and Leopardi's note on the imaginative man's double sight are particularly to be remembered. Both quotations dwell on the inspiration of nature. In fact the whole

of Chap. V on that subject is stimulating, though while alluding to John Mill's *Autobiography*, Professor Neff has overlooked his even more significant but inconvenient essay *On Nature*.

Unfortunately this book quickens the reader's attention so effectively that he cannot help asking questions which the critic does not answer. One feels that while certain authors stand out clearly and convincingly in the pattern, others, who may well claim to be representative, seem to be no more than tangled and attenuated threads. Why is there no clear picture of Tennyson, Browning or Hugo? Much more should have been made of the Symbolists. Neither Meredith, nor Yeats is discussed, nor Thomas Hardy, though much of his best verse was composed, if not published, before 1900. In an essay which has so often to face the conflict between influence and originality, technique and inspiration, some notice should have been taken of the prosody and experiments inaugurated by G. M. Hopkins and Bridges. In fact the whole treatment of the nineteenth century, despite the author's flashes of lucid exposition, is incomplete and at times almost fragmentary. There are too many loose threads and fugitive glimpses. As we look backward through the eighteenth to the seventeenth century, during which periods the tendencies are supposed to be more definite and comprehensive, we still wonder where Thomson's *Seasons* would find a place, or such contrasts as Schiller's *Aufwärterung* and *Der Spaziergang* (Schiller's whole achievement and significance are surely dismissed too lightly), or Dryden's *Feast of Alexander* with its daring flights of thought and experiments in emphasis and broken rhythms. Does Milton, in his old age, wholeheartedly conform to the classical epic canon with his unexpected bursts of scathing satire, his undertones of self-revelation and the sometimes immensely effective liberties he took with his metre? Does Corneille especially in his rapt and rhythmic monologue of *Polyeucte* speak with the Cartesian understatement which Racine exemplified?

These are some of the doubts which arise and which Professor Neff perhaps could (but certainly has not) set at rest. Possibly he has given so much space to excerpts and illustrations, that he has hardly left himself room to adjust the seeming anomalies. But it appears more likely that his choice of subject has necessarily led him to dwell on the externalities of poetry—on the audience, the influences, the topical interests—and too little on the creative ferment which probably changes less than the environment. He studies the succession

of targets at which the arrow is aimed rather more than its actual flight. One sometimes feels that all poets, however varied and elusive their impressions, are nevertheless striving to make human experience and emotion conform to a sense of fitness and distinction. For instance when Blake's drawings were criticized because they were so clear-cut, he replied that outlines might be blurred in nature, but not in the intellect; and Browning explained that *The Ring and the Book* was an attempt to disentangle a murder story by the light of poetic wisdom. One might also doubt whether the poets of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries achieved, or even tried to achieve, Cartesian regularity always with marked success. Their outlook was more limited, but even this restriction is partly due to the perspective of time. They knew more about passion and impulse than we do, and their studied moderation sometimes seems cold because their phraseology has through the lapse of years lost its intensity.

So unless Professor Neff's book is read very carefully, with an eye continually fixed on the chosen aspect of his theme, it will not fully satisfy the student. He will be asking whether evolution does or does not outweigh revolution. But whatever the impression, he will return to poetry with a clearer mind, and new data on which to work.

H. V. ROUTH.

**The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations.** With an Introduction by BERNARD DARWIN. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1941. Pp. xviii+879. 25s. net.

This, although not, perhaps, quite so impeccable as its compilers and publisher would seem to claim, is by far the best dictionary of English quotations (the few foreign quotations form no more than a kind of Appendix, though a very useful one) that has yet appeared. Not only does it contain about 40,000 quotations, but also, as every work of this kind should, and as the *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* does not, a really intelligent and exhaustive index, which occupies no less than 300 pages, and in which an average of two key-words to every line has been allowed. Both Mr. Bernard Darwin, in a most agreeable Introduction, and the compilers, in their short address to the reader, insist that 'this is not a private anthology, but a collection of the quotations which the public knows best' (p. vi), and that 'during the whole work of selection a great effort was made to restrict the

entries to actual current quotations and not to include phrases which the various editors or contributors believed to be quotable or wanted to be quoted' (p. xiii); and on the jacket it is stated, almost menacingly, that the book 'shows what to use and what *not* to use'; the implication being, apparently, that any quotation not to be found here is one that 'the public' does not know and ought not to be expected to know. Everything depends on what is meant by 'the public': if by that word is intended the vast and miscellaneous body periodically examined by the disciples of Gallup and of Mass Observation, what it might be expected to know could only, it would seem, be ascertained by something like a process of complete enumeration, and by perambulatory and peripatetic methods to which the compilers have not, presumably, resorted; if, on the other hand, the word is intended to mean, as it would have meant during the eighteenth, and during at least the first half of the nineteenth, centuries, and as it seems, on the whole, and in spite of some confusion of thought, to have meant to the compilers, *les honnêtes gens*, the only sound procedure would be, surely, having first persuaded oneself that one possessed the necessary qualification of being *honnête* oneself, to assume that all other *honnêtes gens* would share one's opinions as to what was quotable and what was not, and to act accordingly. The only other possible procedure would be to attempt to give 'the public' what you think it would like, as distinct from what you think it ought to like, or from what you yourself like, a procedure which has doubtless been responsible for the unsatisfying programmes of many so-called 'popular' concerts, and for much of what the B.B.C. describes as 'Light Entertainment', and which would seem to be the most reasonable explanation of the inclusion here (among so much that is rightly included) of many passages from Bridges, William Watson, and others which are feeble or commonplace without being really funny, and which no one with an eye for the quotable would ever dream of either using or recording.

To return to that menacing statement on the jacket, that this book 'shows what to use and what *not* to use', the reviewer will now venture to offer, not the results of any profound research or of a laborious attempt to exploit the occasional deficiencies of a work he regards with admiration and gratitude, but a few of the omissions from the entries under the greater and more familiar names which immediately struck him, and which, in spite of having been warned, he still proposes, upon fit occasion, 'to use'.

*Aubrey.*

Anno 1670, not far from Cirencester, was an apparition: being demanded, whether a good spirit, or a bad? returned no answer, but disappeared with a curious perfume and most melodious twang. Mr. W. Lilly believes it was a fairy (*Miscellanies*, section on *Apparitions*).

*Max Beerbohm.*

'Generically it is.'—Reply of his Grace to an 'average undergraduate standing on the steps of Queen's' who protested that his name was not Smith (*Zuleika Dobson*).

*Burke.*

You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament (*Speech on Election at Bristol*, 1774).

No citizen of Europe could be altogether an exile in any part of it (*Letters on a Regicide Peace*, letter 1).

Do not dream that your letters of office, and your instructions, and your suspending clauses are the things that hold together the great contexture of this mysterious whole (*Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies*).

*'Hudibras' Butler.*

For the more languages a man can speak,  
His talent has but sprung the greater leak;  
And for the industry h' has spent upon't,  
Must full as much some other way discount.  
The Hebrew, Chaldee, and the Syriac,  
Do, like their letters, set men's reason back,  
And turn their wits that strive to understand it,  
(Like those that write the characters) left-handed:  
Yet he that is but able to express  
No sense at all in several languages,  
Will pass for learned than he that's known  
To speak the strongest reason in his own.

(*Upon the Imperfection and Abuse of Human Learning*, Pt. I, ll. 57-68.)

*Sir Edward Coke.*

Description of the Inns of Court as 'the most famous Universitie for profession of law only, or of any one human Science that is in the world' (*Reports*, Pt. III, Preface).

*Collins.*

And bade the lovely scenes at distance hail!  
(*The Passions*.)



*Cowley.*

When you have pared away all the vanity, what solid and natural contentment does there remain, which may not be had with five hundred pounds a year? (*Of Greatness.*)

For the few hours of life allotted me,  
Give me (great God) but bread and liberty,  
I'll beg no more: if more thou'rt pleas'd to give,  
I'll thankfully the overplus receive:  
If beyond this no more be freely sent,  
I'll thank for this and go away content.

(*Of Liberty.*)

To thy bent mind some relaxation give,  
And steal one day out of thy life to live.

(*Ib.*)

If ever I more riches did desire  
Than cleanliness and quiet do require:  
If e'er ambition did my fancy cheat  
With any wish so mean as to be great,  
Continue, heaven, still from me to remove  
The humble blessings of that life I love.

(*Of Greatness*—verses of which Hurd, in his selection, remarked 'Why are these verses in every one's mouth, but because they are the language of the heart?')

The first two lines of the paraphrase of Horace's *Odi profanum vulgus* in the same essay (*Of Greatness*) are given, but not the last four:

Go, level hills, and fill up seas,  
Spare nought that may your wanton fancy please;  
But, trust me, when you have done all this,  
Much will be missing still, and much will be amiss.

*Cromwell.*

Cromwell receives little more than half a column (Bridges, it may be remarked in passing, receives five columns). Since Mr. Bernard Darwin, in his Introduction, expatiates at some length upon Mr. Churchill's recent and notable use of a quotation from Clough, it is all the more remarkable that the compilers have omitted Mr. Amery's only slightly less recent and even more notable repetition of that famous conflation of Sidney, Whitelocke, Ludlow plus Carlyle which Cromwell is supposed to have addressed to the Rump:

'It is not fit that you should sit here any longer!' You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing lately. 'You shall now give place to

better men! . . . 'Depart, I say; and let us have done with you. In the name of God,—go! (*Letters and Speeches*, ed. Lomas, II, 264-5).

What shall we do with this bauble? Take it away!

(*Op. cit.*, II, 265.)

I raised such men as had the fear of God before them, as made some conscience of what they did.

(Cromwell in a speech to his Second Parliament, 13 April, 1657, recalling his advice to Hampden at the beginning of the Civil War: *op. cit.*, III, 66.)

It's no longer disputing, but out instantly all you can (Letter to the Commissioners at Cambridge, 6 Aug., 1643: *op. cit.*, I, 147).

I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain that knows what he fights for, and loves what he knows, than that which you call a gentleman and is nothing else (Letter to Sir W. Spring, Sept. 1643, from which only the sentence 'A few honest men are better than numbers' is here quoted: *op. cit.*, I, 154).

Let us all not be careful what use men will make of these actings. They shall, will they, nill they, fulfil the good pleasure of God, and so shall serve our generations. Our rest we expect elsewhere: that will be durable (Letter to Oliver St. John, after the battle of Preston, Sept. 1, 1648: *op. cit.*, I, 350).

What a crowd come out to see your Lordship's triumph!—Yes, but if it were to see me hanged, how many more would there be! (Entry into London on return from Ireland, May 31, 1650: *op. cit.*, II, 57).

I had rather that Mahometanism were permitted amongst us, than that one of God's children should be persecuted (Reply, c. Feb. 1652, to one who declared his preference for 'a persecuting Saul rather than an indifferent Gallio': Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, II, 520-1).

#### *Davenant.*

Christian Religion hath the innocence of Village neighbourhood (*Preface to Gondibert*).

#### *Richard Edwardes.*

Where griping grief the hart would wound, and dolful domps the mind oppresse,

Then musick with her siluer sound is wont with spede to geue redresse (*Paradise of Daintie Deuises*: partly quoted by Shakespeare in *Romeo and Juliet*, IV, v, 122 ff.).

#### *Fuller.*

Our captain counts the image of God nevertheless his image cut in ebony as if done in ivory; and in the blackest Moors he sees the representation of the King of Heaven (*Holy State*, II, xxv, 5).

*Gibbon.*

The successors of Charles the Fifth may disdain their brethren of England; but the romance of *Tom Jones*, that exquisite picture of human manners, will outlive the palace of the Escorial and the imperial eagle of the house of Austria (*Memoirs*, ed. Birkbeck Hill, p. 5).

*Gladstone.*

Although the reviewer does not care to notice the absence of quotations he has been unable to verify, he will mention that, in one of his attacks on Turkish misrule, Gladstone used some such phrase as 'Millions who dare not lift up their hands to their heavenly Father lift them to you', and will take this opportunity to remark that, not perhaps complete concordances, but at least catch-word indexes, to the more notable phrases in the speeches, letters, and works of Cromwell, Burke, Gladstone and other statesmen are *desiderata* upon the preparation of which research students might, perhaps, be more profitably employed than in the writing of immature and unnecessary monographs.

*Hazlitt.*

No young man believes he shall ever die. It was a saying of my brother's, and a fine one (*On the Feeling of Immortality in Youth*).

*Langland.*

Charite . . .

Lyf, and Love, and Leaute in o by-leyve and lawe,  
A love-knotte of leaute and of leel by-leyve,  
Alle kynne cristene clevynge on o wyl,  
With-oute gyle and gabbynge gyve and selle and lene.  
(C text, xviii, 125 ff., description of the true Church.)

*J. S. Mill.*

If the maker of the world *can* all that he wills, he wills misery, and there is no escape from the conclusion (*Three Essays on Religion*).

*Alexander Montgomerie.*

Of his most famous poem at least the refrain

The nicht is neir gone

might have been included.

*Swift.*

The quotations from Swift are by no means adequate, and many stock-phrases and proverbial expressions which he introduced into

his *Polite Conversation* by way of satire are here given as though they were his own inventions. Of the more notable omissions, the following may be mentioned:

that simplicity, without which no human performance can arrive to any great perfection (*Letter to a Young Clergyman*).

I should be glad to see you the instrument of introducing into our style that simplicity which is the best and truest ornament of most things in life, which the politer ages always aimed at in their building and dress (*simplex munditiis*), as well as their productions of wit (*Tatler*, No. 230).

A perpetual possession of being well deceived (definition of happiness in the *Tale of a Tub*, Sect. IX).

I have been frequently assured by great ministers that politics were nothing but common sense, which, as it was the only true thing they spoke, so it was the only thing they could have wished I should not believe (*Some Free Thoughts upon the Present State of Affairs*).

I have ever hated all nations, professions, and communities, and all my love is toward individuals. . . . But principally I hate and detest that animal called man; although I heartily love John, Peter, Thomas, and so forth (*Letter to Pope*, Sept. 29, 1725).

Henry Vaughan.

And here in *dust* and *dirt*, O here  
The *Lilies* of his love appear!

(*The Revival*.)

#### LATIN QUOTATIONS

*Petronius*.

From the fragment (P. L. M., IV, 101) beginning

Foeda est in coitu, et brevis voluptas

Translated by Ben Jonson at the end of *Underwoods*, might have been included the last three lines, which have, surely, become current since F. H. Bradley, to the puzzlement of many of his readers, used them as a peroration in his *Ethical Studies*:

Hic nullus labor est, ruborque nullus;  
Hoc juvit, juvat, et diu juvabit:  
Hoc non deficit, incipitque semper.

*St. Augustine*.

The phrase 'Securus iudicat orbis terrarum' is, as usual, quoted apart from its context and forced to bear the hardly possible meaning:

'The verdict of the world is conclusive.' This was certainly not what St. Augustine meant when he wrote:

Securus iudicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum in quacumque parte terrarum.

'The careless', or 'the confident, judgment of the world' would be the correct translation, *securus* having, not the meaning that *secure* has now, but the meaning it had when Ben Jonson (imitating Seneca, *Hippolytus*, 164), at the conclusion of his *Epode* (No xi in *The Forrest*) wrote:

Man may securely sinne, but safely never—

A line which might well have been included here.

*Tacitus.*

(of the Christians) haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti sunt (*Annals*, xv, 44).

J. B. LEISHMAN.

**Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes.**

By HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1939. London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. Pp. xxii+428. \$4.00; 22s. 6d. net.

Professor Perry is the author of *The Comic Spirit in Restoration Comedy* (1925), which was reviewed in *R.E.S.* for January 1926. I have been amusing myself by re-reading the review. 'Professor Perry brings a ripe mind and a restrained wisdom to bear on the problem of the Comic Spirit. . . . He possesses complete detachment . . . full of close and practical reasoning . . . a body of unobtrusive and well-digested learning . . . a rich feeling for dramatic pattern'. And a good deal more in the same hyperbolic vein. I wonder. Did we all lay it on with a trowel in those intoxicating middle-twenties?

My own impression of the earlier book was that it was rather thin and rather pretentious, but that the writing was good and that among a lot of unnecessary hair-spinning there were one or two really original ideas. I imagine it was a young man's book, and as such it was decidedly promising. But I cannot say that *Masters of Dramatic Comedy* fulfils that or any other promise. It is one of those guide books. Professor Perry takes us remorselessly through every act of the principal European comedies from the *Acharnians* (425 B.C.) to Shaw's *Apple Cart* (1929). There are chapters on Aristophanes and Menander, Plautus and Terence, Ben Jonson, Lope de Vega and

his school, Molière, Holberg, Goldoni, Lessing and Raimund, Gogol, Turgenev and Chekhov, and Shaw. And a few of the lesser fry are squeezed in at the beginnings and ends of chapters. The manner is straightforward, if a little pedestrian:

'In *The Gallantries of Belisa* ("Las bazarrias de Belisa") the heroine's object is to secure the affections of a man who, at the beginning of the play, is devoted to another woman. She oversteps the code of female propriety in pursuing the man she loves, but she does it so dexterously that she succeeds in winning his heart without compromising her dignity. She saves his life, she helps him financially, and she aids him in his wooing of another woman with such success that, when the other woman capitulates, the hero finds that he is in love with his ally, not with the object of his supposed adoration. Belisa's rival then attempts to turn Belisa against the hero by telling her that he has boasted that Belisa has pursued him. Belisa is not unnaturally angry at such a true interpretation of the facts in the case, but her constancy of purpose overrides even this blow to her pride. She loves the hero so deeply that, although she is angry at his supposed criticism of her, she continues to be of assistance to him, even when he becomes jealous of her relations with another man.'

This kind of literary history always recalls to me the 'delightful dilemma' with which Bridges's Professor Sylvester (presumably James Joseph Sylvester, the mathematician) posed a translator of Horace: 'If he thought the original was like that, what can he have seen in it to make him think that it was worth translating?'

The 'social themes' which Professor Perry promises us in his title are conspicuous by their absence. It is true that in discussing Ben Jonson he calls attention, as he could hardly fail to do, to Jonson's preoccupation in his plays with money in its various forms, but he makes no attempt to relate this 'theme' with the 'society' of Jonson's time. Professor Perry has missed an interesting opportunity here. I suspect that if he had taken his analysis of the greed-motiv in Jonson's plays one or two steps farther, he would have found its 'social' origin in James I's policy of keeping a restraining hand on the money-making proclivities of his nobility and gentry. Jonson was a Court poet, and in ridiculing Volpone, Sir Epicure Mammon and the others he was probably simply putting the orthodox Court point of view. The only hint that Professor Perry drops that he is even aware of the problem is a casual reference to 'the growth of capitalistic finance during the Renaissance'. But the growth of



capitalism is, of course, the central social fact of the sixteenth century. All the 'social themes' of its comedy are dominated by it. Throughout Jonson's life capitalism was continuously inserting the thin ends of wedges in the social order England had inherited from the Middle Ages. New class-divisions and new class-wars were in constant process of formation. And comedy, whose social function is essentially the pacification of class-warfare, was set as formidable a task as it has ever been set. It is against this background that any profitable discussion of Jonson's 'social themes' must surely be set. Professor Perry's book is a convenient guide book, but (like so many guide books) it leaves out the things we really want to know.

F. W. BATESON.

**The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature.** By George Sampson. London: Cambridge University Press. 1941. Pp. xiv+1094. 15s. net.

This *Concise History*, based upon the great co-operative *History* in sixteen volumes, is something more than the result of compression and compilation. Mr. Sampson, using his original as a basis or starting-point, sets out to address 'the great Variety of Readers to whom, indeed, all literature belongs'. Whereas the full-length work was intended primarily for the student, the *Concise History* makes its appeal to Everyman, whom the author would assist to 'the enjoyment of literature'.

It may be said at once that Mr. Sampson has produced a book which is a marvel of erudition. He ranges between Beowulf and Widsith on the first page and Chesterton on the last, apparently with equal competence and security, and he enlivens the whole volume by his trenchant presentation and lively style. No doubt his knowledge has the support of the original contributors, whose method, plan and conclusions he for the most part adopts and adapts. But everywhere there is the stamp of his own personality and of his first-hand acquaintance with the writings he discusses. Nor does he hesitate, when so disposed, to alter and correct and recast the work of even the greatest scholars responsible for the original *History*. 'The writer of an epitome . . . may not transform his matter, but he may add or amend'; he may 'move freely' within his terms of reference. Mr. Sampson has interpreted this principle in his own fashion and has successfully poured new wine into old bottles.

This gladly conceded, one is free to question whether he has, or

could have, succeeded in his avowed intention to produce 'a guide to reading, not a substitute for reading', a book which 'does not offer a collection of opinions that a reader can take over ready-made'. In the nature of the case it can do nothing else. Everyman will not consult this—or any other—textbook, or peruse any history of literature, unless with the object of discovering what he is expected to think of a particular book he has heard of or has happened to read, or, alternatively, of learning with what author or book it is worth his while to become acquainted. The more concise and readable the authority to whom he refers, the more dangerous the influence exerted upon the enquirer. This is the inescapable danger of the textbook, and it cannot be overcome by good intentions of introducing the reader to 'famous books themselves' rather than to information about them.

It is only too possible to quote such a saying as: 'In spite of many golden moments, *The Excursion* is a disappointing termination of *The Prelude*', and to ignore the subsequent exhortation: 'Everybody must read *The Excursion* once.' And similarly, again and again. Anyone with Mr. Sampson's teaching experience must know that it is just this kind of use to which the schoolboy will put his book if he gets the chance—a very good reason for keeping it out of school libraries, however great its merits. And is the unsophisticated adult reader better able to be trusted than his juniors, who at any rate have teachers at hand to see that the 'books themselves' are not taken entirely on trust? The present writer is of opinion that while works of reference are obviously indispensable to the beginner as well as to the scholar, 'concise histories' of literature provide very dangerous reading for the inexperienced, even when, as with the volume in question, 'sources and foreign affiliations', theories, 'vast abstractions' and 'generalities' are conscientiously avoided. From this point of view, the danger is increased rather than lessened by the merits of the book. Nor is it diminished by the verdicts passed on writers not highly esteemed by Mr. Sampson, whose trenchant opinions lend themselves to repetition, all the more readily when they are unfavourable. It is his virtue to transform his condensations and rewritings into the vehicles of his own opinions: it is his misfortune that so often the twist given leaves an unpleasant impression which was not conveyed by anything to be found in the unabridged *History*. Here is one example in support of this allegation, but it by no means stands alone: Of Congreve

(p. 422), Mr. Sampson writes, as his final summing-up: 'He lacked the larger virtues of character, charity and humanity; and so Goldsmith and Sheridan, who had some measure of those gifts, remain alive when Congreve is merely embalmed in the enthusiasm of the "intelligentsia".' There is no counterpart to this in Whibley's chapter, where, on the contrary, the account ends on a note of praise for 'the poet who used the English tongue with perfect mastery, and who, alone of his race and time, was fit to tread a measure in wit and raillery with Molière himself'.

Similarly, the final section on *Late Victorian and Post Victorian Literature*, which is Mr. Sampson's avowed contribution, written throughout by him, is, particularly in its accounts of still living and recently deceased writers, more strongly coloured by his aversions than by his responsiveness. Agreed that 'we have a clear right to liberty of discrimination', and that 'the elderly criticism which fawns upon the young is disgusting', there yet appears a middle way that avoids undue acerbity. Without particularising by quotation or reference those passages to which we prefer not to give undue prominence, we note also the curious lack of proportion which permits the total exclusion or mere naming of some writers of distinction while finding room for comparatively lengthy discussion of others who are already almost forgotten.

This last weakness may be illustrated by examples of the treatment of writers who are not contemporary. The section headed 'The Poetry of Spenser' covers a bare two and a half pages; of these, little more than half a page is given to *The Faerie Queene*, and most of that deals with the characteristics of allegory in general and of the allegory of Spenser in particular, concluding with the assertion that 'Spenser . . . lets us down. . . . He tried to do too many things at once; and in elaborating intellectually the allegorical plot he has confused the imaginative substance of the poetic narrative.' As part of a detailed account of Spenser's achievement such statements may possibly be justified, but as the sole criticism of the *Faerie Queene* for 'the great Variety of Readers' who are looking for guidance it is surely lacking in seductiveness! After this 'cooling card' even the following three lines of praise for the 'word-painter' and 'supreme poet-musician' will hardly inspire them to read this 'famous book' for themselves.

Comparing the proportionate space allotted to writers assuredly less important both intrinsically and historically than Spenser, we

note that Drayton gets two pages, Massinger two, Gray three and a quarter, Swinburne three, Barrie four, Kipling two and a half as poet and the same as writer of fiction. Among the greater poets, Dryden gets six pages, Pope five, Blake rather more than six and Tennyson four and a half.

It is perhaps not just to deduce Mr. Sampson's relative estimates of worth from a merely quantitative survey of this kind. But it is fair to complain that something is amiss with the structure of his history when the plan admits such varieties of treatment.

We should be loth to conclude this review of his labours on a carping note, the more so because he has successfully achieved his difficult task. He has epitomized and condensed the work of the many specialists who produced the *Cambridge History of Literature* into a single, unified volume; he has set upon it the stamp of his own mind, and style and judgment, and he has produced a work of reference which is for the most part reliable and invariably readable.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

**Proceedings of the British Academy, 1939.** London. Published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. Pp. xiv+421. 30s. net.

'It is one of the ironies of history', said Dr. G. P. Gooch, lecturing in 1939, 'that the disciples, whom the author of *Leviathan* failed to find in his own country and his own time, are crowding the continental stage after the lapse of three hundred years'. Significantly the international celebration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Hobbes's birth was held at Kiel in 1938 by the Hobbes Society founded by a German. Events since the delivery of this lecture have not diminished either the irony of the situation, or the interest of Dr. Gooch's masterly analysis of Hobbes's political thought, or of his portrait of this curious Englishman, with the trenchant yet cautious style, whose thought was so much robuster than his courage. Hobbes was not more successful in the conclusions he reached in his broad ranging over all the fields of intellectual enquiry. His difference with Descartes remains an unhappy symbol of his adventures in science. Nevertheless Dr. Gooch convincingly demonstrates that Hobbes was a master mind. For if his own findings found no acceptance, he was the head and founder of materialistic philosophy, from which an ever widening stream of thought has never ceased to flow.

Those at least who were at school before 1914 will delight in Mr.

G. M. Young's critical retrospect upon the Victorian Laureate. Tennyson had been the friend of schoolmasters (then was the profession's golden age in more ways than one), and he might also well be called the Schoolmasters' Poet. For in that 'vast profusion of poetic learning, of ornate phrasing and verbal music' they had an inexhaustible field for exposition and they did not neglect it. At any rate, whether at school or not, there was no escape. 'Tennyson was The Poet' in Mr. Young's phrase, and Poetry was Tennyson's poetry for all sorts and conditions in that long age. In an admirably objective piece of historical criticism he shows how Tennyson came to achieve and hold his unique position. He largely pivots his argument on the various appeal of Enoch Arden. When one considers that poem and others does it not come to this? Tennyson was a poetical Royal Academician, or rather he was the Royal Academy in poetry. It is all there, a whole exhibition; the landscapes, the seascapes, the decent cottage interiors, the battle pieces, the historical reconstructions which are not so very historical, a little science to keep abreast with the times, all treated with unfailing virtuosity by a representational artist, but with next to no passion or depth. Tennyson did have his great moments, and Mr. Young has not missed them.

The above lectures are the chief literary contributions to this volume. A few lines must suffice to notice the other ones which come within the range of English studies.

But for a chance J. M. Kemble might have been shot with his friends on the esplanade at Malaga. He had taken part in a political rising which lost nothing in his dramatic telling of it in later life. He was not a Kemble for nothing. Professor Bruce Dickins gives a lively account of this and of other episodes in a wayward career, and does justice to Kemble's place as a pioneer in Old English scholarship whom Maitland and Stubbs valued. A full bibliography will be of great use to students. Professor H. B. Charlton's Shakespeare Lecture on '*Romeo and Juliet* as an Experimental Tragedy' is packed with learning on early Italian drama and criticism and on Shakespeare's predecessors. Mr. W. H. V. Reade lectured on Dante's vision of history and came to the conclusion that Dante read into other periods the scholastic and other medieval ideas in which he himself had been bred. In a word he was like a great many other men. Among the obituary notices that by Professor Oliver Elton on Lascelles Abercrombie with a bibliography calls for mention and commendation here.

D. M. Low.

## SHORT NOTICES

**Studies in the Comic.** By B. H. BRONSON, J. R. CALDWELL, W. H. DURHAM, B. H. LEHMAN, GORDON MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941; London: Cambridge University Press, 1942. Pp. iv+155-298. 9s. net.

This collection of six essays by members of the English Department at the University of California is notable for a first-rate study of *The Beggar's Opera* by Mr. B. H. Bronson. Hitherto most of us have too much tended to take it for granted that Gay was parodying the contemporary Italian operas at the Haymarket. Mr. Bronson is the first to provide chapter and verse on the extent of Gay's knowledge of Handel and makes it virtually certain that in a number of scenes he was getting at Handel's *Floridante*. I find Mr. Bronson less persuasive when he argues that Gay was a social revolutionary and Macheath a precursor of Beaumarchais' Figaro. Surely *The Beggar's Opera* is simply a particularly deft example of the standard Tory diatribes against the moneyed interests that we also find in Dryden, Swift, and Pope.

The other essays in the collection are on *Measure for Measure*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Tristram Shandy*, 'The Solemn Romantics' (i.e. Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats and their alleged lack of humour), and 'Dickens and Daumier'. A certain pretentiousness in their use of English must be recorded against these Californian critics, including Mr. Bronson.

F. W. BATESON.

**De Quincey: A Portrait.** By J. CALVIN METCALF. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1940. Pp. x+210. \$2.00.

This book is a biography containing some critical matter and intended for students who need a comparatively brief study which will yet give them the essential facts. This purpose it fulfils, although the style in which it is written may irritate some readers by its combination of abruptness with "elegant variation". Two characteristic passages may be quoted in illustration:

Before his guardian replied, De Quincey returned to St. John's Priory. Colonel Penson was still there. The military man had brought with him from India several fine horses, one of which slipped on the November ice and broke her master's leg. Colonel Penson was in bed for a month. Thomas and Mrs. Quincey took turns in reading to the invalid. (Pp. 37-8.)

And, on the next page, referring to De Quincey's interview with Dr. Cyril Jackson—

The gracious manners of the elder scholar had put him at ease, while the unusual knowledge and fluency of the eighteen-year-old visitor favourably impressed the kindly official.

In the same connection it would be interesting to know why Mr. Metcalf calls Mrs. Hannah More either Mistress More or Mistress Hannah More. There seems to be no reason for this reversion to the usage of the seventeenth century.

On points of fact Mr. Metcalf is cautious in accepting De Quincey's statements unless corroborated, and, if here and there he may seem for a moment to abandon his caution, his last chapter makes it clear that he returns to it. His portrait of De Quincey gives an impression of essential fidelity and justice, though he perhaps makes insufficient allowance for the evidence of contemporaries who were not charmed by De Quincey's manners and who were inclined to regard his inaccuracies as lies. But, to adopt the useful distinction of the Ettrick Shepherd, De Quincey indulged in *leaving*, not *lying*, and Mr. Metcalf rightly points out the fictional quality of much of his best work. For the rest, a man who is to so high a degree a journalist of genius may be allowed some of the faults as well as almost all the virtues of a journalist.

E. C. B.



## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, March 1942—  
Akenside and others (W. L. Renwick), pp. 94-102.

ELH, Vol. IX, No. 1, March 1942—

The romantic movement: a selective and critical bibliography for the year 1941 (ed. Walter Graham), pp. 1-35.

Coleridge's borrowings from the German (Joseph Warren Beach), pp. 36-58.

Romantic Apologiae for Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia (Arthur Palmer Hudson), pp. 59-70.

*The Egoist* and the Willow Pattern (Robert D. Mayo), pp. 71-8.

HISTORY, Vol. XXVI, No. 103, December 1941—

Anglo-Norman and the historian (M. Dominica Legge), pp. 163-75.

New light on George Savile, first Marquis of Halifax, 'the Trimmer' (H. C. Foxcroft), pp. 176-87.

LIBRARY, Vol. XXII, Nos. 2-3, September-December 1941—

Notes on the size of the sheet (Graham Pollard), pp. 105-37.

Manuscript printer's copy for a lost early English book (H. C. Schulz), pp. 138-44.

On a Huntington Library MS. (MS. HM 130) of the *Prick of Conscience*.

Imposition by half-sheets (William H. Bond), pp. 163-7.

Some additional poems by George Chapman (Jean Robertson), pp. 168-76.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LVII, No. 3, March 1942—

'Thy gentillesse' in *Wife of Bath's tale*, D 1159-62 (Germaine Dempster), pp. 173-6.

'That precious corpus Madrian' (George L. Frost), pp. 177-9.

On *Canterbury Tales*, B 3082.

*Gernemuðe*: a place-name puzzle in *Lazemon Brut* (Roland Blenner-Hassett), pp. 179-81.

Two new manuscript versions of Milton's Hobson poems (G. Blakemore Evans), pp. 192-4.

On Folger MS. 1. 21, fols. 79<sup>v</sup>-80<sup>r</sup>, and Huntington MS. HM 116, pp. 100-1.

- An unpublished letter from Abraham Cowley (J. Simmons), pp. 194-5.  
 On Bodleian, MS. Carte 130, fol. 169.  
 When did Tennyson meet Hallam? (T. H. Vail Motter), pp. 209-10.  
 Housman, Dehmel and Dante (Chandler B. Beall), p. 211.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES No. 4, April 1942—

- Poe, critic of Voltaire (Percy G. Adams), pp. 273-5.  
 Beowulf and Grendel's mother: two minor parallels from folklore  
 (L. Whitbread), pp. 281-2.  
 G. H. Calvert's translations from the German (C. W. Hagge), pp. 282-4.  
 Kenelm Digby's 'Thuscan Virgil' (Chandler B. Beall), p. 284.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 182, March 14, 1942—

- Miscellaneous letters to and about James Hogg (Alan Lang Strout),  
 pp. 142-4.  
 Cf. *N. & Q.*, Vol. 181, December 13, 1941, pp. 324-7; December 27, pp.  
 352-9; Vol. 182, January 31, 1942, pp. 59-61. Continued Vol. 182, April 11,  
 1942, pp. 198-200; April 18, pp. 215-8; May 16, pp. 268-9.

## — March 21—

- Scott's *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*: outside contributors  
 (Coleman O. Parsons), pp. 156-8.  
 Concluded March 28, pp. 173-4.

## — March 28—

- Emendations in Johnson's Letters (R. W. Chapman), pp. 174-6.  
 Continued April 11, pp. 201-2.

## — April 4—

- Notes on the Oxford English Dictionary (St. Vincent Troubridge),  
 pp. 184-6.  
 Notes on some theatrical words: continued April 11, pp. 202-4; April 18,  
 pp. 218-9; April 25, pp. 228-30; May 9, pp. 256-9; May 16, pp. 271-3;  
 May 30, pp. 300-2.  
 Joseph Warton to William Hayley (Ernest A. Sadler), p. 189.  
 A holograph letter of March 19, 1784.

## — April 19—

- Mansfield Park* (M. H. Dodds), pp. 212-3.

## — April 25—

- Poe's tale 'The Lighthouse' (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 226-7.

## — May 2—

- The seed of a Shakespeare sonnet? (A. Davenport), pp. 242-4.  
 On the similarity in imagery between 'When forty winters' and one of the  
 Eclogues in Drayton's *Shepherd's Garland*, 1593.

## — May 16—

- Alleged descents from Chaucer (E. A. Greening Lamborn), p. 268.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 182, May 23—

Proposals for a new London theatre in 1737 (Emmett L. Avery), pp. 286-7.

— May 30—

Edward Cocker and *Cocker's English Dictionary* (Gertrude E. Noyes), pp. 298-300.

BULLETIN OF THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XVII, No. 1, January 1942—

Shakspeare and his contemporaries: a classified bibliography for 1941 (Samuel A. Tannenbaum), pp. 2-24.

Et in Illyria Feste (J. W. Draper), pp. 25-32.

Horatio's commentary: a study in the warp and woof of *Hamlet* (Julia Grace Wales), pp. 40-56.

An emendation in *Romeo and Juliet* (H. Edward Cain), pp. 57-60.

On III. i. 68-70 ('*A la stoccata*').

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 7, 1942—

A Byron poem? (Baroness Wentworth), p. 116.

Cf. *T.L.S.*, February 7, p. 67; February 14, p. 84. Reply from Duncan Gray, March 14, p. 128; from W. N. Brown, March 28, p. 157.

A correction in Trollope (R. W. Chapman), p. 116.

— March 14—

Horace Walpole and Wm. Robertson (W. Forbes Gray), p. 132.

Reply from Catherine Carswell, April 25, p. 211.

— March 21—

Dryden's *State of Innocence* (G. Blakemore Evans), p. 144.

— March 28—

*The Old Man's Head* (F. S. Boas), p. 168.

On 'a forgotten work of Esther Copley (née Hewlett), 1824, introducing Shakespeare to the young.

The songs in *The Critic* (Alfred Lowenberg), p. 168.

— April 4—

*The Demon Barber* (Montague Summers), p. 180.

On George Dibdin Pitt's melodrama.

— April 11—

Delpini, *The Critic* and the Barber (M. Willson Disher), p. 187.

Observations on Alfred Lowenberg's letter (March 28) and Montague Summers's on *Sweeney Todd* (April 4). Reply from Montague Summers, April 18, p. 199; from M. Willson Disher, April 25, p. 211; from Montague Summers, May 9, p. 235; from M. Willson Disher, May 16, pp. 247, 250.

John Gilpin (Joan Wake), p. 192.

'Æschylus' Soliloquy' (G. D. Hobson), p. 189.

On the poem attributed to Mrs. Browning.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 18—

A. E. Housman's 'borrowings' (G. B. A. Fletcher), p. 199.

*The Constant Lovers* (B. H. Newdigate), p. 204.

On an eclogue by T. R. (?Thomas Randolph), and other poems, in an early seventeenth-century commonplace book (Huntington MS. HM 904). Concluded April 25, p. 216.

## — May 9—

Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* (Frank Mott Harrison), p. 235.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of an edition 'Printed for F. Smith, at the Elephant and Castle . . . n.d., 8vo.', purchased by 'Haxell' at Sotheby's in 1909.

A Wordsworth date (E. de Selincourt), p. 240.

On the date of 'Intimations of Immortality'.

## — May 16—

Rossetti's tragedy (Helen Madox Rossetti Angeli), p. 247.

A further letter, May 23, p. 259; see also May 30, p. 271.

## — May 23—

Nicholas Chaucer (Alan S. C. Ross), p. 264.

## — May 30—

Lost Bacon editions (R. W. Gibson), p. 271.

An enquiry concerning their whereabouts.

A good name lost: Ben Jonson's lament for S.P. (Gerald Eades Bentley), p. 276.

early  
Con-

ith, at  
heby's

ley),